

Henry J. Brugger
AN
ESSAY

CONCERNING

Human Understanding;

WITH

Thoughts on the Conduct of the Understanding;

BY JOHN LOCKE, ESQ.

COLLATED WITH DESMAIZEAUX'S EDITION.

To which is prefixed,

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

L O N D O N :

PRINTED FOR ALLEN & WEST, PATER NOSTER ROW, J. MUNDELL
AND CO. EDINBURGH, W. OZLEY & CO. GAINSBOROUGH,
AND J. & A. DUNCAN, GLASGOW.

1795.

Phil 2115.32.3

v A

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
GIFT OF
RALPH BARTON PERRY
JUN 8 1940

K

C O N T E N T S.

BOOK IV.—CHAP. I.

OF KNOWLEDGE AND OPINION.

Of Knowledge in general.

SECT.

1. Our Knowledge conversant about our Ideas.
2. Knowledge is the Perception of the Agreement or Disagreement of two Ideas.
3. This Agreement fourfold.
4. First, Of Identity or diversity.
5. Secondly, Relation.
6. Thirdly, Of Co-existence.
7. Fourthly, Of real Existence.
8. Knowledge actual or habitual.
9. Habitual Knowledge twofold.

CHAP. II.

Of the Degrees of our Knowledge.

SECT.

1. Intuitive.
2. Demonstrative.
3. Depends on Proofs.
4. But not so easy.
5. Not without precedent Doubt.
6. Not so clear.
7. Each Step must have intuitive Evidence.
8. Hence the Mistake *ex præcognitis et præconcessis*.
9. Demonstration not limited to Quantity.

- 10-13. Why it has been so thought.
- 14. Sensitive Knowledge of particular Existence.
- 15. Knowledge not always clear, where the Ideas are so.

C H A P. III.

Of the Extent of Human Knowledge.

SECT.

- 1. First, no farther than we have Ideas.
- 2. Secondly, no farther than we can perceive the Agreement or Disagreement.
- 3. Thirdly, Intuitive Knowledge extends itself not to all the Relations of all our Ideas.
- 4. Fourthly, Nor demonstrative Knowledge.
- 5. Fifthly, Sensitive Knowledge narrower than either.
- 6. Sixthly, our Knowledge therefore narrower than our Ideas.
- 7. How far our Knowledge reaches.
- 8. First, Our Knowledge of Identity and Diversity, as far as our Ideas.
- 9. Secondly, Of Co-existence a very little way.
- 10. Because the Connection between most simple Ideas is unknown.
- 11. Especially of secondary Qualities.
- 12-14. And farther, because all Connection between any secondary and primary Qualities is undiscoverable.
- 15. Of Repugnancy to co-exist larger.
- 16. Of the Co-existence of Powers a very little Way.
- 17. Of Spirits yet narrower.
- 18. Thirdly, Of other Relations, it is not easy to say how far. Morality capable of Demonstration.
- 19. Two Things have made moral Ideas thought incapable of Demonstration. Their Complexedness and Want of sensible Representations.
- 20. Remedies of those Difficulties.
- 21. Fourthly, Of real Existence, we have an intuitive Knowledge of our own, demonstrative of God's, sensible of some few other Things.
- 22. Our Ignorance great.
- 23. First, One Cause of its Want of Ideas, either such as we have no Conception of, or such as particularly we have not.
- 24. Because of their Remoteness, or,

CONTENTS.

25. Because of their Minuteness.
26. Hence no Science of Bodies.
27. Much less of Spirits.
28. Secondly, Want of a discoverable Connection between Ideas we have.
29. Instances.
30. Thirdly, Want of tracing our Ideas.
31. Extent in respect of Universality.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Reality of our Knowledge.

SECT.

1. Objection, Knowledge placed in Ideas, may be all bare Vision.
- 2, 3. Answer, Not so, where Ideas agree with Things.
4. As, First, All simple Ideas do.
5. Secondly, All complex Ideas excepted.
6. Hence the Reality of Mathematical Knowledge.
7. And of Moral.
8. Existence not required to make it real.
9. Nor will it be less true or certain, because moral Ideas are of our own making and naming.
10. Misnaming disturbs not the certainty of the Knowledge.
11. Ideas of Substances have their Archetypes without us.
12. So far as they agree with those, so far our Knowledge concerning them is real.
13. In our Inquiries about Substances, we must consider Ideas, and not confine our Thoughts to Names or Species supposed set out by Names.
- 14-17. Objection against a Changeling being something between Man and Beast, answered.
18. Recapitulation.

CHAP. V.

Of Truth in general.

SECT.

1. What Truth is.
2. A right joining, or separating of Signs; i. e. Ideas or Words.
3. Which make mental or verbal Propositions.

4. Mental Propositions are very hard to be treated of.
5. Being nothing but the joining, or separating Ideas without Words.
6. When mental Propositions contain real Truth, and when verbal.
7. Objection against verbal Truth, that it may be thus all chimerical.
8. Answered, real Truth is about Ideas agreeing to Things.
9. Falschhood is the joining of Names otherwise than their Ideas agree.
10. General Propositions to be treated of more at large.
11. Moral and metaphysical Truth.

C H A P. VI.

Of universal Propositions, their Truth and Certainty.

SECT.

1. Treating of Words, necessary to Knowledge.
2. General Truths hardly to be understood, but in verbal Propositions.
3. Certainty two-fold, of Truth and of Knowledge.
4. No Proposition can be known to be true, where the Essence of each Species mentioned, is not known.
5. This more particularly concerns Substances.
6. The Truth of few universal Propositions concerning Substances, is to be known.
7. Because Co-existence of Ideas in few Cases to be known.
- 8, 9. Instance in Gold.
10. As far as any such Co-existence can be known, so far universal Propositions may be certain. But this will go but a little way, because,
- 11, 12. The Qualities which make our complex Ideas of Substances, depend mostly on external, remote, and unperceived Causes.
13. Judgment may reach farther, but that is not knowledge.
14. What is requisite for our Knowledge of Substances.
15. Whilst our Ideas of Substances contain not their real Constitutions, we can make but few general certain Propositions concerning them.
16. Wherein lies the general certainty of Propositions.

CONTENTS.

vii

CHAP. VII.

Of Maxims.

SECT.

1. They are self-evident.
2. Wherein that Self-evidence consists.
3. Self-evidence not peculiar to received Axioms.
4. First, As to Identity and Diversity, all Propositions are equally self-evident.
5. Secondly, In Co-existence we have few self-evident Propositions.
6. Thirdly, In other Relations we may have.
7. Fourthly, Concerning the real Existence, we have none.
8. These Axioms do not much influence our other Knowledge.
- 9, 10. Because they are not the Truths the first known.
11. What Use these general Maxims have.
12. Maxims, if care be not taken in the Use of Words, may prove Contradictions.
13. Instance in *Vacuum*.
14. They prove not the Existence of Things without us.
15. Their Application dangerous about complex Ideas.
- 16-18. Instance in Man.
19. Little Use of these Maxims in Proofs where we have clear and distinct Ideas.
20. Their Use dangerous, where our Ideas are confused.

CHAP. VIII.

Of Trifling Propositions.

SECT.

1. Some Propositions bring no Increase to our Knowledge.
- 2, 3. As, First, Identical Propositions.
4. Secondly, When a part of any complex Idea is predicated of the whole.
5. As part of the Definition of the defined.
6. Instance—Man and Palfry.
7. For this teaches but the Signification of Words.
8. But no real Knowledge.

9. General Propositions concerning Substances, are often trifling.
10. And why.
11. Thirdly, Using Words variously is trifling with them.
12. Marks of verbal Propositions. First, Predication is abstract.
13. Secondly, A Part of the Definition predicated of any Term.

CHAP. IX.

Of our Knowledge of Existence.

SECT.

1. General certain Propositions concern not Existence.
2. A threefold Knowledge of Existence.
3. Our Knowledge of our own Existence is intuitive.

CHAP. X.

Of the Existence of a God.

SECT.

1. We are capable of knowing certainly, that there is a God.
2. Man knows, that he himself is.
3. He knows also, that nothing cannot produce a Being, therefore something eternal.
4. That eternal Being must be most powerful.
5. And most knowing.
6. And therefore God.
7. Our Idea of a most perfect Being, not the sole Proof of a God.
8. Something from Eternity.
9. Two Sorts of Beings, cogitative and incogitative.
10. Incogitative Being cannot produce a cogitative.
- 11, 12. Therefore there has been an eternal Wisdom.
13. Whether material or no.
14. Not material, First, Because every Particle of Matter is not cogitative.
15. Secondly, One Particle alone of Matter cannot be cogitative.
16. Thirdly, A System of incogitative matter cannot be cogitative.
17. Whether in Motion, or at Rest.
- 18, 19. Matter not co-eternal with an eternal Mind.

C O N T E N T S.

ix

C H A P. XI.

Of the Knowledge of the Existence of other Things.

SECT.

1. Is to be had only by Sensation.
2. Instance, Whiteness of this Paper.
3. This, though not so certain as Demonstration, yet may be called Knowledge, and proves the Existence of Things without us.
4. First, because we cannot have them but by the Inlet of the Senses.
5. Because an Idea from actual Sensation, and another from Memory, are very distinct Perceptions.
6. Thirdly, Pleasure or Pain, which accompanies actual Sensation, accompanies not the returning of those Ideas without the external Objects.
7. Fourthly, Our Senses assist one another's Testimony of the Existence of outward Things.
8. This Certainty is as great as our Condition needs.
9. But reaches no farther than actual Sensation.
10. Folly to expect Demonstration in every Thing.
11. Past Existence is known by Memory.
12. The Existence of Spirits not knowable.
13. Particular Propositions concerning Existence are knowable.
14. And general Propositions concerning abstract Ideas.

C H A P. XII.

Of the Improvement of our Knowledge.

SECT.

1. Knowledge is not from Maxims.
2. The Occasion of that Opinion.
3. But from the comparing clear and distinct Ideas.
4. Dangerous to build upon precarious Principles.
5. This no certain way to Truth.
6. But to compare clear complete Ideas under steady Names.
7. The true Method of advancing Knowledge, is by considering our abstract Ideas.
8. By which, Morality also may be made clearer.

C O N T E N T S.

9. But Knowledge of Bodies is to be improved only by Experience.
10. This may procure us Convenience, not Science.
11. We are fitted for moral Knowledge, and natural Improvements.
12. But must beware of Hypotheses and wrong Principles.
13. The true Use of Hypotheses.
14. Clear and distinct Ideas with settled Names, and the finding of those which show their Agreement or Disagreement, are the ways to enlarge our Knowledge.
15. Mathematics an Instance of it.

C H A P. XIII.

Some other Considerations concerning our Knowledge.

SECT.

1. Our Knowledge partly necessary, partly voluntary.
2. The Application voluntary; but we know as things are, not as we please.
3. Instances in Number.

C H A P. XIV.

Of Judgment.

SECT.

1. Our Knowledge being short, we want something else.
2. What Use to be made of this twilight Estate.
3. Judgment supplies the want of Knowledge.
4. Judgment is the presuming Things to be so, without perceiving it.

C H A P. XV.

Of Probability.

SECT.

1. Probability is the Appearance of Agreement upon fallible Proofs.
2. It is to supply the want of Knowledge.
3. Being that which makes us presume Things to be true, before we know them to be so.

C O N T E N T S.

xi

4. The Grounds of Probability are two; Conformity with our own Experience, or the Testimony of others Experience.
5. In this all the Agreements, *pro* and *con*, ought to be examined, before we come to a judgment.
6. They being capable of great Variety.

C H A P. XVI.

Of the Degrees of Assent.

SECT.

1. Our Assent ought to be regulated by the Grounds of Probability.
2. These cannot always be all actually in view, and then we must content ourselves with the remembrance that we once saw ground for such a Degree of Assent.
3. The ill Consequence of this, if our former Judgment were not rightly made.
4. The right use of it, is mutual Charity and Forbearance.
5. Probability is either of Matter of Fact or Speculation.
6. The concurrent Experience of all other Men with ours, produces Assurance approaching to Knowledge.
7. Unquestionable Testimony and Experience for the most part produce Confidence.
8. Fair Testimony, and the Nature of the thing indifferent, produces also confident Belief.
9. Experience and Testimonies clashing, infinitely vary the Degrees of Probability.
10. Traditional Testimonies, the farther removed, the less their Proof.
11. Yet History is of great use.
12. In things which Sense cannot discover, Analogy is the great Rule of Probability.
13. One Case where contrary Experience lessens not the Testimony.
14. The bare Testimony of Revelation is the highest Certainty.

CHAP. XVII.

Of Reason

SECT.

1. Various Significations of the word Reason.
2. Wherein Reasoning consists.
3. Its four parts.
4. Syllogism not the great Instrument of Reason.
5. Helps little in Demonstration, less in Probability.
6. Serves not to increase our Knowledge, but fence with it.
7. Other Helps should be sought.
8. We reason about Particulars.
9. First, Reason fails us for want of Ideas.
10. Secondly, Because of obscure and imperfect Ideas.
11. Thirdly, For want of intermediate Ideas.
12. Fourthly, Because of wrong Principles.
13. Fifthly, Because of doubtful Terms.
14. Our highest Degree of Knowledge is intuitive without reasoning.
15. The next is Demonstration by reasoning.
16. To supply the Narrowness of this, we have nothing but Judgment upon probable Reasoning.
17. Intuition, Demonstration, Judgment.
18. Consequences of Words, and Consequences of Ideas.
19. Four sorts of Arguments: First, *Ad Verecundiam*.
20. Secondly, *Ad Ignorantiam*.
21. Thirdly, *Ad Hominem*.
22. Fourthly, *Ad Judicium*.
23. Above, contrary, and according to Reason.
24. Reason and Faith not opposite.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of Faith and Reason, and their distinct Provinces.

SECT.

1. Necessary to know their Boundaries.
2. Faith and Reason, what, as contra-distinguished.
3. No new simple Idea can be conveyed by traditional revelation.
4. Traditional Revelation may make us know Propositions knowable also by Reason, but not with the same Certainty that Reason doth.

C O N T E N T S.

xiii

5. Revelation cannot be admitted against the clear Evidence of Reason.
6. Traditional Revelation much less.
7. Things above Reason.
8. Or not contrary to Reason, if revealed, are Matter of Faith.
9. Revelation, in Matters where Reason cannot judge, or but probably, ought to be hearkened to.
10. In Matters where Reason can afford certain Knowledge, that is to be hearkened to.
11. If the Boundaries be not set between Faith and Reason, no Enthusiasm, or Extravagancy in Religion, can be contradicted.

C H A P. XIX.

Of Enthusiasm.

SECT.

1. Love of Truth necessary.
2. A Forwardness to dictate, whence.
3. Force of Enthusiasm.
4. Reason and Revelation.
5. Rise of Enthusiasm.
- 6, 7. Enthusiasm.
- 8, 9. Enthusiasm mistaken for seeing and feeling.
10. Enthusiasm how to be discovered.
11. Enthusiasm fails of Evidence, that the Proposition is from God.
12. Firmness of Persuasion, no Proof that any Proposition is from God.
13. Light in the Mind, what.
14. Revelation must be judged by Reason.
15. Belief no Proof of Revelation.

C H A P. XX.

Of wrong Assent, or Error.

SECT.

1. Causes of Error.
2. First, Want of Proofs.
3. *Obj.* What shall become of those who want them, answered.
4. People hindered from Inquiry.

5. Secondly, Want of Skill to use them.
6. Thirdly, Want of Will to use them.
7. Fourthly, Wrong Measures of Probability: whereof,
- 8-10. First, Doubtful Propositions taken for Principles.
11. Secondly, Received Hypotheses
12. Thirdly, predominant Passions.
13. The Means of evading Probabilities, 1st, Supposed Fallacy.
14. 2^{dly}, Supposed Arguments for the contrary.
15. What Probabilities determine the Assent.
16. Where it is in our power to suspend it.
17. Fourthly, Authority.
18. Men not in so many Errors as is imagined.

CHAP. XXI.

Division of the Sciences.

SECT.

1. Three sorts.
2. First, *Physica*.
3. Secondly, *Practica*.
4. Thirdly, *Speculativa*.
5. This is the first Division of the Objects of Knowledge.

OF HUMAN UNDERSTANDING.

BOOK IV.—CHAP. I.

OF KNOWLEDGE IN GENERAL.

§ 1. *Our knowledge conversant about our Ideas,*

SINCE the *mind*, in all its thoughts and reasonings, hath no other immediate object but its own *ideas*, which it alone does or can contemplate, it is evident, that our knowledge is only conversant about them.

§ 2. *Knowledge is the Perception of the Agreement or Disagreement of two Ideas.*

KNOWLEDGE then seems to me to be nothing but *the perception of the connection and agreement, or disagreement and repugnancy of any of our Ideas*. In this alone it consists. Where this perception is, there is knowledge; and where it is not, there, though we may fancy, guess, or believe, yet we always come short of knowledge. For when we know that *white is not black*, what do we else but perceive that these two *ideas* do not agree? when we possess ourselves with the utmost security of the demonstration, that *the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right ones*, what do we more but perceive, that equality to two right ones, does necessarily agree to, and is inseparable from the three angles of a triangle?

§ 3. *This agreement fourfold.*

BUT to understand a little more distinctly, wherein this agreement or disagreement consists, I think we may reduce it all to these four sorts:

1. *Identity, or diversity.*
2. *Relation.*
3. *Co-existence, or necessary connection.*
4. *Real existence.*

§ 4. 1. *Of identity or diversity.*

FIRST, As to the first sort of agreement or disagreement *viz. identity or diversity.* It is the first act of the mind, when it has any sentiments or *ideas* at all, to perceive its *ideas*; and so far as it perceives them, to know each what it is, and thereby also to perceive their difference, and that one is not another. This is so absolutely necessary, that without it there could be no knowledge, no reasoning, no imagination, no distinct thoughts at all. By this the mind clearly and infallibly perceives each *idea* to agree with itself, and to be what it is; and all distinct *ideas* to disagree, *i. e.* the one not to be the other: and this it does without pains, labour or deduction; but at first view, by its natural power of perception and distinction. And though men of art have reduced this into those general rules, *What is, is; and it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be;* for ready application in all cases, wherein there may be occasion to reflect on it; yet it is certain, that the first exercise of this faculty is about particular *ideas*. A man infallibly knows, as soon as ever he has them in his mind, that the *ideas* he calls *white* and *round*, are the very *ideas* they are, and that they are not other *ideas* which he calls *red* or *square*. Nor can any maxim or proposition in the world make him know it clearer or surer than he did before, and without any such general rule. This then is the first agreement or disagreement, which the mind perceives in its *ideas*; which it always perceives at first sight: and if there ever happen any doubt about it, it will always be found to be about the names, and not the *ideas* themselves, whose identity and diversity will always be perceived, as soon and as clearly as the *ideas* themselves are, nor can it possibly be otherwise.

§ 5. 2. *Relative.*

SECONDLY, The next sort of agreement, or disagreement, the mind perceives in any of its *ideas*, may, I think, be called *relative*, and is nothing but *the perception of the relation between any two ideas*, of what kind soever, whether substances, modes, or any other. For since all distinct *ideas* must eternally be known not to be the same, and so be universally and constantly denied one of another, there could be no room for any positive knowledge at all, if we could not perceive any relation between our *ideas*, and find out the agreement or disagreement they have one with another, in several ways the mind takes of comparing them.

§ 6. 3. *Of co-existence.*

THIRDLY, The third sort of agreement, or disagreement, to be found in our *ideas*, which the perception of the mind is employed about, is *co-existence*, or *non-co-existence* in the same subject; and this belongs particularly to substances. Thus, when we pronounce concerning *gold* that it is fixed, our knowledge of this truth amounts to no more but this, that fixedness, or a power to remain in the fire unconsumed, is an *idea* that always accompanies and is joined with that particular sort of yellowness, weight, fusibility, malleableness, and solubility in *aqua regia*, which make our complex *idea*, signified by the word *gold*.

§ 7. 4. *Of real existence.*

FOURTHLY, The fourth and last sort is that of *actual real existence* agreeing to any *idea*. Within these four sorts of agreement or disagreement, is, I suppose, contained all the knowledge we have, or are capable of: For all the inquiries that we can make concerning any of our *ideas*, all that we know or can affirm concerning any of them, is, That it is, or is not, the same with some other; that it does, or does not, always co-exist with some other *idea* in the same subject; that it has this or that relation to some other *idea*; or that it has a real existence without the mind. Thus *blue is not yellow*, is of identity: *Two triangles upon equal bases between*

two parallels are equal, is of relation: *Iron is susceptible of magnetical impressions* is of co-existence: *God is*, is of real existence. Though identity and co-existence are truly nothing but relations, yet they are so peculiar ways of agreement or disagreement of our *ideas*, that they deserve well to be considered as distinct heads, and not under relation in general; since they are so different grounds of affirmation and negation, as will easily appear to any one, who will but reflect on what is said in several places of this essay. I should now proceed to examine the several degrees of our knowledge, but that it is necessary first to consider the different acceptations of the word *knowledge*.

§ 8. *Knowledge actual or habitual.*

THERE are several ways wherein the mind is possessed of truth, each of which is called *knowledge*.

1. There is *actual knowledge*, which is the present view the mind has of the agreement or disagreement of any of its *ideas*, or of the relation they have one to another.

2. A man is said to know any proposition, which having been once laid before his thoughts, he evidently perceived the agreement or disagreement of the *ideas* whereof it consists; and so lodged it in his memory, that whenever that proposition comes again to be reflected on, he, without doubt or hesitation, embraces the right side, assents to, and is certain of the truth of it. This, I think, one may call *habitual knowledge*: and thus a man may be said to know all those truths which are lodged in his memory, by a foregoing clear and full perception, whereof the mind is assured past doubt, as often as it has occasion to reflect on them. For our finite understandings being able to think clearly and distinctly but on one thing at once, if men had no knowledge of any more than what they actually thought on, they would all be very ignorant; and he that knew most would know but one truth, that being all he was able to think on at one time.

§ 9. *Habitual knowledge twofold.*

OF habitual knowledge, there are also, vulgarly speaking, two degrees :

First, The one is of *such truths laid up in the memory, as whenever they occur to the mind, it actually perceives the relation is between those ideas.* And this is in all those truths, whereof we have an *intuitive knowledge* ; where the *ideas* themselves, by an immediate view, discover their agreement or disagreement one with another.

Secondly, The other is of *such truths, whereof the mind having been convinced, it retains the memory of the conviction without the proofs.* Thus a man that remembers certainly that he once perceived the demonstration, that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right ones, is certain that he knows it, because he cannot doubt of the truth of it. In his adherence to a truth, where the demonstration by which it was at first known is forgot, though a man may be thought rather to believe his memory than really to know, and this way of entertaining a truth seemed formerly to me like something between opinion and knowledge ; a sort of assurance which exceeds bare belief, for that relies on the testimony of another : yet upon a due examination I find it comes not short of perfect certainty, and is in effect true knowledge. That which is apt to mislead our first thoughts into a mistake in this matter, is, that the agreement or disagreement of the *ideas* in this case is not perceived, as it was at first, by an actual view of all the intermediate *ideas*, whereby the agreement or disagreement of those in the proposition was at first perceived ; but by other intermediate *ideas*, that show the agreement or disagreement of the *ideas* contained in the proposition whose certainty we remember. For example, in this proposition, that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right ones, one who has seen and clearly perceived the demonstration of this truth, knows it to be true, when that demonstration is gone out of his mind ; so that at present it is not

actually in view, and possibly cannot be recollected : but he knows it in a different way from what he did before. The agreement of the two *ideas* joined in that proposition is perceived, but it is by the intervention of other *ideas* than those which at first produced that perception. He remembers, *i. e.* he knows (for remembrance is but the reviving of some past knowledge) that he was once certain of the truth of this proposition, that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right ones. The immutability of the same relations between the same immutable things, is now the *idea* that shows him, that if the three angles of a triangle were once equal to two right ones, they will always be equal to two right ones. And hence he comes to be certain, that what was once true in the case, is always true; what *ideas* once agreed, will always agree; and consequently what he once knew to be true, he will always know to be true, as long as he can remember that he once knew it. Upon this ground it is, that particular demonstrations in mathematics afford general knowledge. If then the perception that the same *ideas* will eternally have the same habitudes and relations, be not a sufficient ground of knowledge, there could be no knowledge of general propositions in mathematics; for no mathematical demonstration would be any other than particular: and when a man had demonstrated any proposition concerning one triangle or circle, his knowledge would not reach beyond that particular diagram. If he would extend it farther, he must renew his demonstration in another instance, before he could know it to be true in another like triangle, and so on: by which means one could never come to the knowledge of any general propositions. No body, I think, can deny that Mr. Newton certainly knows any proposition, that he now at any time reads in his book, to be true; though he has not in actual view that admirable chain of intermediate *ideas*, whereby he at first discovered it to be true. Such a memory as that, able to retain such a train of particulars, may

be well thought beyond the reach of human faculties ; when the very discovery, perception, and laying together that wonderful connection of *ideas*, is found to surpass most readers comprehension. But yet it is evident, the author himself knows the proposition to be true, remembering he once saw the connection of those *ideas*, as certainly as he knows such a man wounded another, remembering that he saw him run him through. But because the memory is not always so clear as actual perception, and does in all men more or less decay in length of time, this amongst other differences is one, which shows that *demonstrative knowledge* is much more imperfect than *intuitive*, as we shall see in the following chapter.

CHAP. II.

OF THE DEGREES OF OUR KNOWLEDGE.

§ 1. *Intuitive.*

ALL our knowledge consisting, as I have said, in the view the mind has of its own *ideas*, which is the utmost light and greatest certainty we with our faculties, and in our way of knowledge, are capable of, it may not be amiss to consider a little the degrees of its evidence. The different clearness of our knowledge seems to me to lie in the different way of perception the mind has of the agreement or disagreement of any of its *ideas*. For if we will reflect on our own ways of thinking, we shall find that sometimes the mind perceives the agreement or disagreement of two *ideas* immediately by themselves, without the intervention of any other : and this, I think, we may call *intuitive knowledge*. For in this, the mind is at no pains of proving or examining, but perceives the truth, as the eye doth light, only by being directed toward it. Thus the mind perceives, that *white* is not *black*, that a *circle* is not a *triangle*, that *three* are more than *two*, and equal to *one* and *two*. Such kind of truths the mind perceives at the first sight of the *ideas* together, by bare *intuition*, without the inter-

vention of any other *idea*; and this kind of knowledge is the clearest and most certain, that human frailty is capable of. This part of knowledge is irresistible, and, like bright sun shine, forces itself immediately to be perceived, as soon as ever the mind turns its view that way; and leaves no room for hesitation, doubt, or examination, but the mind is presently filled with the clear light of it. It is on this *intuition* that depends all the certainty and evidence of all our knowledge; which certainty every one finds to be so great, that he cannot imagine, and therefore not require a greater: for a man cannot conceive himself capable of a greater certainty, than to know that any *idea* in his mind is such as he perceives it to be; and that two *ideas*, wherein he perceives a difference, are different, and not precisely the same. He that demands a greater certainty than this, demands he knows not what, and shows only that he has a mind to be a sceptic, without being able to be so. Certainty depends so wholly on this intuition, that in the next degree of *knowledge*, which I call *demonstrative*, this intuition is necessary in all the connections of the intermediate *ideas*, without which we cannot attain knowledge and certainty.

§ 2. *Demonstrative.*

THE next degree of knowledge is, where the mind perceives the agreement or disagreement of any *ideas*, but not immediately. Though wherever the mind perceives the agreement or disagreement of any of its *ideas*, there be certain knowledge; yet it does not always happen, that the mind sees that agreement or disagreement which there is between them, even where it is discoverable: and in that case remains in ignorance, and at most gets no farther than a probable conjecture. The reason why the mind cannot always perceive presently the agreement or disagreement of two *ideas*, is, because those *ideas*, concerning whose agreement or disagreement the inquiry is made, cannot by the mind be so put together as to show it. In this case then, when the mind cannot so bring its *ideas* to-

gether, as by their immediate comparifon, and as it were juxta-pofition or application one to another, to perceive their agreement or difagreement, it is fain, by the intervention of other *ideas* (one or more, as it happens) to difcover the agreement or difagreement which it fearches; and this is that which we call *rea-foning*. Thus the mind being willing to know the agreement or difagreement in bignefs, between the three angles of a triangle and two right ones, cannot by an immediate view and comparing them do it: be-cause the three angles of a triangle cannot be brought at once, and be compared with any one or two angles; and fo of this the mind has no immediate, no intuitive knowledge. In this cafe the mind is fain to find out fome other angles, to which the three angles of a tri-angle have an equality; and finding thofe equal to two right ones, comes to know their equality to two right ones.

§ 3. *Depends on Proofs.*

THOSE intervening *ideas* which ferve to fhew the agreement of any two others, are called *proofs*; and where the agreement or difagreement is by this means plainly and clearly perceived, it is called *demonftration*, it being *fhown* to the underftanding, and the mind made fee that it is fo. A quicknefs in the mind to find out thefe intermediate *ideas* (that fhall difcover the agreement or difagreement of any other) and to apply them right, is, I fuppofe, that which is called *fagacity*.

§ 4. *But not fo eafy.*

THIS knowledge by intervening *proofs*, though it be certain, yet the evidence of it is not altogether *fo clear* and bright, nor the affent fo ready, as in *intuitive* knowledge. For though in *demonftration*, the mind does at laft perceive the agreement or difagreement of the *ideas* it confiders, yet it is not without pains and attention: there muft be more than one tranfient view to find it. A fteady application and purfuit is required to this difcovery: and there muft be a progref-fion by fteps and degrees, before the mind can in this

way arrive at certainty, and come to perceive the agreement or repugnancy between two *ideas* that need proofs and the use of reason to show it.

§ 5. *Not without precedent Doubt.*

ANOTHER difference between intuitive and demonstrative knowledge, is, that though in the latter all doubt be removed, when by the intervention of the intermediate *ideas* the agreement or disagreement is perceived; yet before the demonstration there was a doubt, which in intuitive knowledge cannot happen to the mind, that has its faculty of perception left to a degree capable of distinct *ideas*, no more than it can be a doubt to the eye (that can distinctly see white and black) whether this ink and this paper be all of a colour. If there be sight in the eyes, it will at first glimpse, without hesitation perceive the words printed on this paper different from the colour of the paper: and so if the mind have the faculty of distinct perceptions, it will perceive the agreement or disagreement of those *ideas* that produce intuitive knowledge. If the eyes have lost the faculty of seeing, or the mind of perceiving, we in vain inquire after the quickness of sight in one, or clearness of perception in the other.

§ 6. *Not so clear.*

It is true, the perception produced by *demonstration* is also very clear, yet it is often with a great abatement of that evident lustre and full assurance, that always accompany that which I call *intuitive*; like a face reflected by several mirrors one to another, where, as long as it retains the similitude and agreement with the object, it produces a knowledge: but it is still in every successive reflection with a lessening of that perfect clearness and distinctness, which is in the first, till at last, after many removes, it has a great mixture of dimness, and is not at first sight so knowable, especially to weak eyes. Thus it is with knowledge, made out by a long train of proofs.

§ 7. *Each step must have intuitive Evidence.*

Now, in every step reason makes in *demonstrative knowledge*, there is an intuitive knowledge of that agree-

ment or disagreement, it seeks with the next intermediate *idea*, which it uses as a proof: for if it were not so, that yet would need a proof; since without the perception of such agreement or disagreement, there is no knowledge produced. If it be perceived by itself, it is intuitive knowledge; if it cannot be perceived by itself, there is need of some intervening *idea*, as a common measure to show their agreement or disagreement. By which it is plain that every step in reasoning that produces knowledge, has intuitive certainty; which when the mind perceives, there is no more required, but to remember it to make the agreement or disagreement of the *ideas*, concerning which we inquire, visible and certain. So that to make any thing a *demonstration*, it is necessary to perceive the immediate agreement of the intervening *ideas*, whereby the agreement or disagreement of the two *ideas* under examination (whereof the one is always the first, and the other the last in the account) is found. This intuitive perception of the agreement or disagreement of the intermediate *ideas*, in each step and progression of the *demonstration*, must also be carried exactly in the mind, and a man must be sure that no part is left out: which, because in long deductions, and the use of many proofs, the memory does not always so readily and exactly retain; therefore it comes to pass, that this is more imperfect than intuitive knowledge, and men embrace often falsehood for demonstrations.

§ 8. Hence the mistake, *ex præcognitis et præconcessis*. THE necessity of this intuitive knowledge, in each step of scientific or demonstrative reasoning, gave occasion, I imagine, to that *mistaken axiom*, that *all reasoning was ex præcognitis et præconcessis*; which how far it is mistaken, I shall have occasion to show more at large, when I come to consider propositions, and particularly those propositions which are called maxims; and to show that it is by a mistake, that they are supposed to be the foundation of all our knowledge and reasonings.

§ 9 *Demonstration not limited to Quantity.*

IT has been generally taken for granted, that mathematics alone are capable of demonstrative certainty: but to have such an agreement or disagreement, as may intuitively be perceived, being, as I imagine, not the privilege of the *ideas* of *number*, *extension* and *figure* alone; it may possibly be the want of due method and application in us, and not of sufficient evidence in things, that demonstration has been thought to have so little to do in other parts of knowledge, and been scarce so much as aimed at by any but mathematicians. For whatever *ideas* we have, wherein the mind can perceive the immediate agreement or disagreement that is between them, there the mind is capable of intuitive knowledge; and where it can perceive the agreement or disagreement of any two *ideas*, by an intuitive perception of the agreement or disagreement they have with any intermediate *ideas*, there the mind is capable of demonstration, which is not limited to *ideas* of extension, figure, number, and their modes.

§ 10. *Why it has been so thought.*

THE reason why it has been generally sought for, and supposed to be only in those, I imagine has been not only the general usefulness of those sciences, but because, in comparing their equality or excess, the modes of numbers have every the least difference very clear and perceivable: and though in extension, every the least excess is not so perceptible, yet the mind has found out ways, to examine and discover demonstratively the just equality of two angles, or extensions, or figures: and both these, *i. e.* numbers and figures, can be set down by visible and lasting marks, wherein the *ideas* under consideration are perfectly determined; which for the most part they are not, where they are marked only by names and words.

§ 11.

BUT in other simple *ideas*, whose modes and differences are made and counted by degrees, and not quantity, we have not so nice and accurate a distinction of

their differences, as to perceive or find ways to measure their just equality, or the least differences. For those other simple *ideas*, being appearances or sensations, produced in us by the size, figure, number and motion of minute corpuscles singly insensible, their different degrees also depend upon the variation of some, or all of those causes; which since it cannot be observed by us in particles of matter, whereof each is too subtle to be perceived, it is impossible for us to have any exact measures of the different degrees of these simple *ideas*. For supposing the sensation of *idea* we name *whiteness* be produced in us by a certain number of globules, which having a verticity about their own centres, strike upon the *retina* of the eye, with a certain degree of rotation, as well as progressive swiftness, it will hence easily follow, that the more the superficial parts of any body are so ordered, as to reflect the greater number of globules of light, and to give them that proper rotation, which is fit to produce this sensation of white in us, the more white will that body appear, that from an equal space sends to the *retina* the greater number of such corpuscles, with that peculiar sort of motion. I do not say, that the nature of light consists in very small round globules, nor of whiteness in such a texture of parts, as gives a certain rotation to these globules when it reflects them; for I am not now treating physically of light or colours. But this, I think, I may say, that I cannot (and I would be glad any one would make intelligible that he did) conceive how bodies without us can any ways affect our senses, but by the immediate contract of the sensible bodies themselves, as in tasting and feeling, or the impulse of some insensible particles coming from them, as in seeing, hearing and smelling; by the different impulse of which parts, caused by their different size, figure and motion, the variety of sensations is produced in us.

§ 12.

WHETHER then they be globules, or no; or whether they have a verticity about their own centres, that

produce the *idea* of *whiteness* in us, this is certain, that the more particles of light are reflected from a body, fitted to give them that peculiar motion which produces the sensation of whiteness in us; and possibly too, the quicker that peculiar motion is, the whiter does the body appear, from which the greater number are reflected, as is evident in the same piece of paper put in the sun-beams, in the shade, and in a dark hole; in each of which it will produce in us the *idea* of whiteness in far different degrees.

§ 13. *Why it has been so thought.*

NOT knowing therefore what number of particles, nor what motion of them is fit to produce any precise degree of *whiteness*, we cannot demonstrate the certain equality of any two degrees of *whiteness*, because we have no certain standard to measure them by, nor means to distinguish every the least real difference, the only help we have being from our senses, which in this point fail us. But where the difference is so great, as to produce in the mind clearly distinct *ideas*, whose differences can be perfectly retained, there these *ideas* of colours, as we see in different kinds, as blue and red, are as capable of demonstration, as *ideas* of number and extension. What I have here said of *whiteness* and colours, I think, holds true in all secondary qualities, and their modes.

§ 14. *Sensitive Knowledge of particular Existence.*

THESE two, *viz.* intuition and demonstration, are the degrees of our knowledge; whatever comes short of one of these, with what assurance soever embraced, is but faith, or opinion, but not knowledge, at least in all general truths. There is, indeed, another *perception* of the mind, employed about the *particular existence of finite beings* without us; which going beyond bare probability, and yet not reaching perfectly to either of the foregoing degrees of certainty, passes under the name of knowledge. There can be nothing more certain, than that the *idea* we receive from an external object is in our minds; this is intuitive knowledge. But whether there be any thing more than

barely that *idea* in our minds, whether we can thence certainly infer the existence of any thing without us, which corresponds to that *idea*, is that, whereof some men think there may be a question made; because men may have such *ideas* in their minds, when no such thing exists, no such object affects their senses. But yet here, I think, we are provided with an evidence, that puts us past doubting: for I ask any one, whether he be not invincibly conscious to himself of a different perception, when he looks on the sun by day, and thinks on it by night; when he actually tastes wormwood, or smells a rose, or only thinks on that flavour or odour? We as plainly find the difference there is between any *idea* revived in our minds by our own memory, and actually coming into our minds by our senses, as we do between any two distinct *ideas*. If any one say, a dream may do the same thing, and all these *ideas* may be produced in us without any external objects, he may please to dream that I make him this answer: 1. That it is no great matter, whether I remove his scruple, or no: where all is but a dream, reasoning and arguments are of no use, truth and knowledge nothing. 2. That I believe he will allow a very manifest difference between dreaming of being in the fire, and being actually in it. But yet if he be resolved to appear so sceptical, as to maintain, that what I call being actually in the fire is nothing but a dream; and that we cannot thereby certainly know, that any such thing as fire actually exists without us: I answer, that we certainly finding that pleasure or pain follows upon the application of certain objects to us, whose existence we perceive, or dream that we perceive by our senses; this certainty is as great as our happiness or misery, beyond which we have no concernment to know, or to be. So that I think, we may add to the two former sorts of *knowledge* this also, of the existence of particular external objects, by that perception and consciousness we have of the actual entrance of *ideas* from them, and allow these *three degrees of knowledge*, viz. *intuitive, de-*

monstrative, and *sensitive* : in each of which, there are different degrees and ways of evidence and certainty.

§ 15. *Knowledge not always clear, where the Ideas are so.*

BUT since our knowledge is founded on, and employed about our *ideas* only, will it not follow from thence, that it is conformable to our *ideas* ; and that where our *ideas* are clear and distinct, or obscure and confused, our knowledge will be so too ? To which I answer, No : For our knowledge consisting in the perception of the agreement or disagreement of any two *ideas*, its clearness or obscurity consists in the clearness or obscurity of that perception, and not in the clearness or obscurity of the *ideas* themselves ; *v. g.* a man that has as clear *ideas* of the angles of a triangle, and of equality to two right ones, as any mathematician in the world, may yet have but a very obscure perception of their agreement, and so have but a very obscure knowledge of it. But *ideas*, which by reason of their obscurity or otherwise, are confused, cannot produce any clear or distinct knowledge ; because as far as any *ideas* are confused, so far the mind cannot perceive clearly, whether they agree or disagree. Or, to express the same thing in a way less apt to be misunderstood, he that hath not determined the *ideas* to the words he uses, cannot make propositions of them, of whose truth he can be certain.

CHAP. III.

OF THE EXTENT OF HUMAN KNOWLEDGE.

§ 1.

KNOWLEDGE, as has been said, lying in the perception of the agreement or disagreement of any of our *ideas*, it follows from hence, that,

1. *No farther than we have Ideas.*

FIRST, We can have *knowledge* no farther than we have *ideas*.

§ 2. 2. *No farther than we can perceive their Agreement or Disagreement.*

SECONDLY, That we can have no *knowledge* farther than we can have perception of that agreement or disagreement. Which perception being, 1, Either by *intuition*, or the immediate comparing any two *ideas*: or, 2. By *reason*, examining the agreement or disagreement of two *ideas*, by the intervention of some others: Or, 3. By *sensation*, perceiving the existence of particular things: Hence it also follows,

§ 3. 3. *Intuitive Knowledge extends itself not to all the Relations of all our Ideas.*

THIRDLY, That we cannot have an *intuitive knowledge*, that shall extend itself to all our *ideas*, and all that we would know about them, because we cannot examine and perceive all the relations they have one to another by juxtaposition, or an immediate comparison one with another. Thus having the *ideas* of an obtuse, and an acute angled triangle, both drawn from equal bases, and between parallels, I can, by intuitive knowledge, perceive the one not to be the other, but cannot that way know whether they be equal or no; because their agreement or disagreement in equality can never be perceived by an immediate comparing them: The difference of figure makes their parts incapable of an exact immediate application; and therefore, there is need of some intervening quantities to measure them by, which is demonstration, or rational knowledge.

§ 4. 4. *Nor Demonstrative Knowledge.*

FOURTHLY, It follows also, from what is above observed, that our *rational knowledge* cannot reach to the whole extent of our *ideas*: Because between two different *ideas* we would examine, we cannot always find such *mediums*, as we can connect one to another with an intuitive knowledge, in all the parts of the deduction; and wherever that fails, we come short of knowledge and demonstration.

§ 5. 5. *Sensitive Knowledge narrower than either.*

FIFTHLY, *Sensitive knowledge*, reaching no farther

than the existence of things actually present to our senses, is yet much narrower than either of the former.

§ 6. 6. *Our Knowledge, therefore, narrower than our Ideas.*

FROM all which it is evident, that *the extent of our knowledge* comes not only short of the reality of things, but even of the extent of our own *ideas*. Though our knowledge be limited to our *ideas*, and cannot exceed them either in extent or perfection; and though these be very narrow bounds, in respect of the extent of all being, and far short of what we may justly imagine to be in some even created understandings, not tied down to the dull and narrow information is to be received from some few, and not very acute ways of perception, such as are our senses; yet it would be well with us if our knowledge were but as large as our *ideas*, and there were not many doubts and inquiries concerning the *ideas* we have, whereof we are not, nor I believe ever shall be in this world resolved. Nevertheless, I do not question but that human knowledge, under the present circumstances of our beings and constitutions, may be carried much farther than it hitherto has been, if men would sincerely, and with freedom of mind, employ all that industry and labour of thought, in improving the means of discovering truth, which they do for the colouring or support of falsehood, to maintain a system, interest or party they are once engaged in. But yet after all, I think I may without injury to human perfection, be confident, that our knowledge would never reach to all we might desire to know concerning those *ideas* we have; nor be able to surmount all the difficulties, and resolve all the questions that might arise concerning any of them. We have the *ideas* of a *square*, a *circle*, and *equality*; and yet, perhaps, shall never be able to find a circle equal to a square, and certainly know that it is so. We have the *ideas* of *matter* and *thinking*, but possibly shall never be able to know, whether any mere material being thinks, or no; it being impossible for

us, by the contemplation of our own *ideas*, without revelation, to discover, whether omnipotency has not given to some systems of matter fitly disposed, a power to perceive and think, or else joined and fixed to matter so disposed, a thinking immaterial substance: it being, in respect of our notions not much more remote from our comprehension to conceive, that God can, if he pleases, superadd to matter a faculty of thinking, than that he should superadd to it another substance, with a faculty of thinking; since we know not wherein thinking consists, nor to what sort of substances the Almighty has been pleased to give that power, which cannot be in any created being, but merely by the good pleasure and bounty of the Creator. For I see no contradiction in it, that the first eternal thinking Being should, if he pleased, give to certain systems of created senseless matter, put together, as he thinks fit, some degrees of sense, perception and thought: Though, as I think, I have proved, *lib. 4. ch. 10.* it is no less than a contradiction to suppose matter (which is evidently in its own nature void of sense and thought) should be that eternal first thinking Being. What certainty of knowledge can any one have that some perceptions, such as *v. g.* pleasure and pain, should not be in some bodies themselves, after a certain manner modified and moved, as well as that they should be in an immaterial substance, upon the motion of the parts of body? Body, as far as we can conceive, being able only to strike and affect body; and motion, according to the utmost reach of our *ideas*, being able to produce nothing but motion; so that when we allow it to produce pleasure or pain, or the *idea* of a colour or sound, we are fain to quit our reason, go beyond our *ideas*, and attribute it wholly to the good pleasure of our Maker. For since we must allow he has annexed effects to motion, which we can no way conceive motion able to produce, what reason have we to conclude, that he could not order them as well to be produced in a subject we cannot conceive capable of them, as well as in a subject we

cannot conceive the motion of matter can any way operate upon? I say not this, that I would any way lessen the belief of the soul's immateriality: I am not here speaking of probability, but knowledge; and I think not only, that it becomes the modesty of philosophy not to pronounce magisterially, where we want that evidence that can produce knowledge; but also, that it is of use to us to discern how far our knowledge does reach: for the state we are at present in, not being that of vision, we must, in many things, content ourselves with faith and probability; and in the present question, about the immateriality of the soul, if our faculties cannot arrive at demonstrative certainty, we need not think it strange. All the great ends of morality and religion are well enough secured, without philosophical proofs of the soul's immateriality: since it is evident, that he who made us at first begin to subsist here, sensible intelligent beings, and for several years continued us in such a state, can and will restore us to the like state of sensibility in another world, and make us capable there to receive the retribution he has designed to men, according to their doings in this life. And therefore it is not of such mighty necessity to determine one way or the other, as some over-zealous for or against the immateriality of the soul, have been forward to make the world believe. Who, either on the one side, indulging too much their thoughts immersed altogether in matter, can allow no existence to what is not material: or who, on the other side, finding not *cogitation* within the natural powers of matter, examined over and over again by the utmost intention of mind, have the confidence to conclude, that Omnipotency itself cannot give perception and thought to a substance which has the modification of solidity. He that considers how hardly sensation is, in our thoughts, reconcileable to extended matter; or existence to any thing that hath no extension at all, will confess, that he is very far from certainly knowing what his soul is. It is a point which seems to me to be put out of the reach of our

knowledge: And he who will give himself leave to consider freely, and look into the dark and intricate part of each hypothesis, will scarce find his reason able to determine him fixedly for or against the soul's materiality. Since on which side soever he views it, either as an unextended substance, or as a thinking extended matter, the difficulty to conceive either, will, whilst either alone is in his thoughts, still drive him to the contrary side. An unfair way which some men take with themselves: who, because of the unconceivableness of something they find in one, throw themselves violently into the contrary hypothesis, though altogether as unintelligible to an unbiassed understanding. This serves not only to show the weakness and scantiness of our knowledge, but the insignificant triumph of such sort of arguments, which, drawn from our own views, may satisfy us that we can find no certainty on one side of the question; but do not at all thereby help us to truth by running into the opposite opinion, which, on examination, will be found clogged with equal difficulties. For what safety, what advantage to any one is it, for the avoiding the seeming absurdities, and to him unsurmountable rubs, he meets with in one opinion, to take refuge in the contrary, which is built on something altogether as inexplicable, and as far remote from his comprehension? It is past controversy, that we have in us something that thinks; our very doubts about what it is, confirm the certainty of its being, though we must content ourselves in the ignorance of what kind of *being* it is: and it is as vain to go about to be sceptical in this, as it is unreasonable in most other cases to be positive against the being of any thing, because we cannot comprehend its nature. For I would fain know what substance exists, that has not something in it which manifestly baffles our understandings. Other spirits, who see and know the nature and inward constitution of things, how much most they exceed us in knowledge? To which if we add larger comprehension, which enables them at one glance to see the connec-

tion and agreement of very many *ideas*, and readily supplies to them the intermediate proofs, which we by single and slow steps, and long poring in the dark, hardly at last find out, and are often ready to forget one before we have hunted out another; we may guess at some part of the happiness of superior ranks of spirits, who have a quicker and more penetrating sight, as well as a larger field of knowledge. But to return to the argument in hand; our *knowledge*, I say, is not only limited to the paucity and imperfections of the *ideas* we have, and which we employ it about, but even comes short of that too. But how far it reaches, let us now inquire.

§ 7. *How far our Knowledge reaches.*

THE affirmations or negations we make concerning the *ideas* we have, may, as I have before intimated in general, be reduced to these four sorts, *viz.* identity, co-existence, relation, and real existence. I shall examine how far our knowledge extends in each of these.

§ 8. 1. *Our Knowledge of Identity and Diversity as far as our Ideas.*

FIRST, *As to identity and diversity*, in this way of the agreement or disagreement of our *ideas*, *our intuitive knowledge is as far extended as our ideas themselves*: and there can be no *idea* in the mind, which it does not presently, by an intuitive knowledge, perceive to be what it is, and to be different from any other.

§ 9. 2. *Of Co-existence a very little way.*

SECONDLY, *As to the second sort*, which is the *agreement or disagreement of our ideas in co-existence*; in this, our knowledge is very short, though in this consists the greatest and most material part of our knowledge concerning substances. For our *ideas* of the species of substances being, as I have showed, nothing but certain collections of simple *ideas* united in one subject, and so co-existing together; *v. g.* our *idea of flame* is a body hot, luminous, and moving upward; of *gold*, a body heavy to a certain degree, yellow, malleable, and fusible: These, or some such complex

ideas as these in mens minds, do these two names of the different substances, *flame*, and *gold*, stand for. When we would know any thing farther concerning these, or any other sort of substances, what do we inquire, but what other qualities or powers these substances have or have not? which is nothing else but to know what other simple *ideas* do or do not co-exist with those that make up that complex *idea*?

§ 10. *Because the Connection between most simple Ideas is unknown.*

THIS, how weighty and considerable a part soever of human science, is yet very narrow, and scarce any at all. The reason whereof is, that the simple *ideas*, whereof our complex *ideas* of substances are made up, are, for the most part, such as carry with them, in their own nature, no visible necessary connection or inconsistency with any other simple *ideas*, whose co-existence with them we would inform ourselves about.

§ 11. *Especially of Secondary Qualities.*

THE *ideas* that our complex ones of substances are made up of, and about which our knowledge concerning substances is most employed, are those of their *secondary qualities*: which depending all (as has been shown) upon the primary qualities of their minute and insensible parts; or if not upon them, upon something yet more remote from our comprehension, it is impossible we should know which have a necessary union or inconsistency one with another: For not knowing the root they spring from, not knowing what size, figure, and texture of parts they are, on which depend, and from which result those qualities which make our complex *idea* of *gold*, it is impossible we should know what other qualities result from, or are incompatible with the same constitution of the insensible parts of *gold*; and so consequently must always co-exist with that complex *idea* we have of it, or else are inconsistent with it.

§ 12. *Because all Connection between any secondary and primary Qualities is undiscoverable.*

BESIDES this ignorance of the primary qualities of the

insensible parts of bodies, on which depend all their secondary qualities, there is yet another and more incurable part of ignorance, which sets us more remote from a certain knowledge of the *co-existence* or *in-co-existence* (if I may so say) of different *ideas* in the same subject; and that is, that there is no discoverable connection between any *secondary quality*, and *those primary qualities* which it depends on.

§ 13.

THAT the size, figure and motion of one body should cause a change in the size, figure and motion of another body, is not beyond our conception: the separation of the parts of one body upon the intrusion of another; and the change from rest to motion upon impulse; these, and the like, seem to us to have some *connection* one with another. And if we knew these primary qualities of bodies, we might have reason to hope we might be able to know a great deal more of these operations of them one upon another: But our minds not being able to discover any *connection* betwixt these primary qualities of bodies, and the sensations that are produced in us by them, we can never be able to establish certain and undoubted rules of the consequences or *co-existence* of any secondary qualities, though we could discover the size, figure or motion of those invisible parts which immediately produce them. We are so far from knowing what figure, size, or motion of parts produce a yellow colour, a sweet taste, or a sharp sound, that we can by no means conceive how any *size, figure, or motion* of any particles, can possibly produce in us the *idea* of any *colour, taste or sound* whatsoever; there is no conceivable *connection* betwixt the one and the other.

§ 14.

IN vain therefore, shall we endeavour to discover by our *ideas* (the only true way of certain and universal knowledge) what other *ideas* are to be found constantly joined with that of our complex *idea* of any substance: since we neither know the real constitution of the minute parts on which their qualities do depend,

nor, did we know them, could we discover any necessary *connection* between them, and any of the *secondary qualities* : which is necessary to be done before we can certainly know their *necessary co-existence*. So that let our complex *idea* of any species of substances be what it will, we can hardly, from the *simple ideas* contained in it, certainly determine the *necessary co-existence* of any other quality whatsoever. Our knowledge in all these inquiries reaches very little farther than our experience. Indeed, some few of the primary qualities have a necessary dependence and visible connection one with another, as figure necessarily supposes extension : receiving or communicating motion by impulse supposes solidity. But though these, and perhaps some other of our *ideas* have, yet there are so few of them, that have a *visible connection* one with another, that we can by intuition or demonstration discover the co-existence of very few of the qualities are to be found united in substances : and we are left only to the assistance of our senses, to make known to us what qualities they contain. For of all the qualities that are *co-existent* in any subject, without this dependence and evident connection of their *ideas* one with another, we cannot know certainly any two to *co-exist* any farther than experience, by our senses, informs us. Thus, though we see the yellow colour, and upon trial find the weight, malleableness, fusibility, and fixedness, that are united in a piece of gold ; yet because no one of these *ideas* has any evident *dependence*, or necessary connection with the other, we cannot certainly know, that where any four of these are, the fifth will be there also, how highly probable soever it may be : because the highest probability amounts not to certainty, without which there can be no true knowledge. For this *co-existence* can be no farther known than it is perceived ; and it cannot be perceived, but either in particular subjects, by the observation of our senses, or in general, by the necessary *connection* of the *ideas* themselves.

§ 15. *Of Repugnancy to co-existence larger.*

As to incompatibility or repugnancy to co-existence, we may know, that any subject can have of each sort of primary qualities, but one particular at once; *v. g.* each particular extension, figure, number of parts, motion, excludes all other of each kind. The like also is certain of all sensible *ideas* peculiar to each sense; for whatever of each kind is present in any subject, excludes all other of that sort; *v. g.* no one subject can have two smells or two colours at the same time. To this perhaps, will be said, has not an *opall*, or an infusion of *lignum nephriticum*, two colours at the same time? To which I answer, that these bodies, to eyes differently placed, may at the same time afford different colours: but I take liberty also to say, that to eyes differently placed, it is different parts of the object that reflect the particles of light: and therefore it is not the same part of the object, and so not the very same subject, which at the same time appears both yellow and azure. For it is as impossible that the very same particle of any body should at the same time differently modify or reflect the rays of light, as that it should have two different figures and textures at the same time.

§ 16. *Of the Co-existence of Powers a very little way.*

BUT as to the powers of substances to change the sensible qualities of other bodies, which make a great part of our inquiries about them, and is no inconsiderable branch of our knowledge; I doubt, as to these, whether *our knowledge reaches* much farther than our experience; or whether we can come to the discovery of most of these powers, and be certain that they are in any subject, by the connection with any of those *ideas* which to us make its essence. Because the active and passive powers of bodies, and their ways of operating, consisting in a texture and motion of parts, which we cannot by any means come to discover; it is but in very few cases, we can be able to perceive their dependence on, or repugnance to any of those *ideas* which make our complex one of that sort of

things. I have here instanced in the corpuscularian hypothesis, as that which is thought to go farthest in an intelligible explication of the qualities of bodies; and I fear the weakness of human understanding is scarce able to substitute another, which will afford us a fuller and clearer discovery of the necessary connection and *co-existence* of the powers which are to be observed united in several sorts of them. This at least is certain, that whichever hypothesis be clearest and truest (for of that it is not my business to determine), our knowledge concerning corporeal substances will be very little advanced by any of them, till we are made to see what qualities and powers of bodies have a *necessary connection or repugnancy* one with another; which in the present state of philosophy, I think, we know but to a very small degree: and I doubt whether, with those faculties we have, we shall ever be able to carry our general knowledge (I say not particular experience) in this part much farther. Experience is that which in this part we must depend on. And it were to be wished that it were more improved. We find the advantages some mens generous pains have this way brought to the stock of natural knowledge. And if others, especially the philosophers by fire, who pretend to it, had been so wary in their observations, and sincere in their reports, as those who call themselves philosophers ought to have been; our acquaintance with the bodies here about us, and our insight into their powers and operations, had been yet much greater.

§ 17. *Of Spirits yet narrower.*

If we are at a loss in respect of the powers and operations of bodies, I think it is easy to conclude, *we are much more in the dark in reference to spirits*; whereof we naturally have no *ideas*, but what we draw from that of our own, by reflecting on the operations of our own souls within us, as far as they can come within our observation. But how inconsiderable a rank the spirits that inhabit our bodies hold amongst those various and possibly innumerable kinds of no-

bler beings; and how far short they come of the endowments and perfections of cherubims and seraphims, and infinite sorts of spirits above us, is what by a transient hint, in another place, I have offered to my reader's consideration.

§ 18. 3. *Of other Relations it is not easy to say how far.*

As to the third sort of our knowledge, viz. the agreement or disagreement of any of our ideas in any other relation: this, as it is the largest field of our knowledge, so it is hard to determine how far it may extend; because the advances that are made in this part of knowledge, depending on our sagacity in finding intermediate ideas, that may show the relations and habitudes of ideas, whose co-existence is not considered, it is a hard matter to tell when we are at an end of such discoveries; and when reason has all the helps it is capable of, for the finding of proofs, or examining the agreement or disagreement of remote ideas. They that are ignorant of *algebra* cannot imagine the wonders in this kind are to be done by it; and what farther improvements and helps, advantageous to other parts of knowledge, the sagacious mind of man may yet find out, it is not easy to determine. This at least I believe, that the ideas of quantity are not those alone that are capable of demonstration and knowledge; and that other, and perhaps more useful parts of contemplation, would afford us certainty, if vices, passions, and domineering interest did not oppose or menace such endeavours.

Morality capable of Demonstration.

The idea of a Supreme Being, infinite in power, goodness and wisdom, whose workmanship we are, and on whom we depend; and the idea of ourselves, as understanding rational beings, being such as are clear in us, would, I suppose, if duly considered and pursued, afford such foundations of our duty and rules of action, as might place *morality amongst the sciences capable of demonstration*; wherein I doubt not but from self-evident propositions, by necessary conse-

quences, as incontestible as those in mathematics, the measures of right and wrong might be made out to any one that will apply himself with the same indifference and attention to the one, as he does to the other of these sciences. The *relation* of other *modes* may certainly be perceived, as well as those of number and extension: and I cannot see why they should not also be capable of demonstration, if due methods were thought on to examine or pursue their agreement or disagreement. *Where there is no property, there is no injustice*, is a proposition as certain as any demonstration in Euclid: for the *idea* of *property* being a right to any thing; and the *idea* to which the name *injustice* is given, being the invasion or violation of that right; it is evident, that these *ideas* being thus established, and these names annexed to them, I can as certainly know this proposition to be true, as that a triangle has three angles equal to two right ones. Again, *No government allows absolute liberty*: The *idea* of government being the establishment of society upon certain rules or laws which require conformity to them; and the *idea* of absolute liberty being for any one to do whatever he pleases; I am as capable of being certain of the truth of this proposition, as of any in the mathematics.

§ 19. *Two things have made moral Ideas thought incapable of Demonstration. Their complexedness, and want of sensible representations.*

THAT which in this respect has given the advantage to the *ideas* of quantity, and made them thought more capable of certainty and demonstration, is,

First, That they can be set down and represented by sensible marks, which have a greater and nearer correspondence with them than any words or sounds whatsoever. Diagrams drawn on paper are copies of the *ideas* in the mind, and not liable to the uncertainty that words carry in their signification. An angle, circle or square, drawn in lines, lies open to the view, and cannot be mistaken: it remains unchangeable, and may at leisure be considered and examined, and the

demonstration be revived, and all the parts of it may be gone over more than once without any danger of the least change in the *ideas*. This cannot be thus done in *moral ideas*, we have no sensible marks that resemble them, whereby we can set them down; we have nothing but words to express them by: which though, when written, they remain the same, yet the *ideas* they stand for may change in the same man; and it is very seldom that they are not different in different persons.

Secondly, Another thing that makes the greater difficulty in *ethics*, is, that *moral ideas* are commonly more complex than those of the figures ordinarily considered in mathematics. From whence these two inconveniences follow: *First*, That their names are of more uncertain signification, the precise collection of simple *ideas* they stand for not being so easily agreed on, and so the sign that is used for them in communication always, and in thinking often, does not steadily carry with it the same *idea*. Upon which the same disorder, confusion and error follows, as would if a man, going to demonstrate something of a *heptagon*, should in the diagram he took to do it, leave out one of the angles, or by oversight make the figure with one angle more than the name ordinarily imported, or he intended it should, when at first he thought of his demonstration. This often happens, and is hardly avoidable in very complex *moral ideas*, where the same name being retained, one angle, *i. e.* one simple *idea* is left out or put in, in the complex one (still called by the same name) more at one time than another. *Secondly*, From the complexedness of these *moral ideas*, there follows another inconvenience, *viz.* that the mind cannot easily retain those precise combinations, so exactly and perfectly as is necessary in the examination of the habitudes and correspondences, agreements or disagreements, of several of them one with another; especially where it is to be judged of by long deductions, and the intervention of

several other complex *ideas*, to show the agreement or disagreement of two remote ones.

The great help against this which mathematicians find in diagrams and figures, which remain unalterable in their draughts, is very apparent, and the memory would often have great difficulty otherwise to retain them so exactly whilst the mind went over the parts of them step by step, to examine their several correspondences. And though in casting up a long sum, either in *addition*, *multiplication*, or *division*, every part be only a progression of the mind, taking a view of its own *ideas*, and considering their agreement or disagreement; and the resolution of the question be nothing but the result of the whole, made up of such particulars, whereof the mind has a clear perception: yet without setting down the several parts by marks, whose precise significations are known, and by marks that last and remain in view when the memory had let them go, it would be almost impossible to carry so many different *ideas* in mind, without confounding or letting slip some parts of the reckoning, and thereby making all our reasonings about it useless. In which case, the cyphers or marks help not the mind at all to perceive the agreement of any two or more numbers, their equalities or proportions: that, the mind has only by intuition of its own *ideas* of the numbers themselves. But the numerical characters are helps to the memory, to record and retain the several *ideas* about which the demonstration is made, whereby a man may know how far his intuitive knowledge, in surveying several of the particulars, has proceeded; that so he may without confusion go on to what is yet unknown, and at last have in one view before him the result of all his perceptions and reasonings.

§ 20. *Remedies of those Difficulties.*

ONE part of *these disadvantages* in moral *ideas*, which has made them be thought not capable of demonstration, may in a good measure be remedied by definitions, setting down that collection of simple *ideas*, which every term shall stand for, and then using

the terms steadily and constantly for that precise collection. And what methods *algebra*, or something of that kind, may hereafter suggest, to remove the other difficulties, is not easy to foretel. Confident I am, that if men would in the same method, and with the same indifferency, search after moral, as they do mathematical truths, they would find them to have a stronger connection one with another, and a more necessary consequence from our clear and distinct *ideas*, and to come nearer perfect demonstration than is commonly imagined. But much of this is not to be expected, whilst the desire of esteem, riches, or power, makes men espouse the well-endowed opinions in fashion, and then seek arguments either to make good their beauty, or varnish over and cover their deformity: nothing being so beautiful to the eye as truth is to the mind; nothing so deformed and irreconcilable to the understanding, as a lie. For though many a man can with satisfaction enough own a no very handsome wife in his bosom; yet who is bold enough openly to avow, that he has espoused a falsehood, and received into his breast so ugly a thing as a lie? Whilst the parties of men cram their tenets down all mens throats, whom they can get into their power, without permitting them to examine their truth or falsehood, and will not let truth have fair play in the world, nor men the liberty to search after it; what improvements can be expected of this kind? What greater light can be hoped for in the moral sciences? The subject part of mankind in most places might, instead thereof, with *Egyptian* bondage expect *Egyptian* darkness, were not the candle of the Lord set up by himself in mens minds, which it is impossible for the breath or power of man wholly to extinguish.

§ 21. *Of real Existence: we have an intuitive Knowledge of our own; demonstrative, of God's; sensitive, of some few other things.*

As to the fourth sort of our knowledge, *viz.* of the *real actual existence* of things, we have an intuitive knowledge of our own *existence*; a demonstrative

knowledge of the existence of a God ; of the *existence* of any thing else, we have no other but a sensitive knowledge, which extends not beyond the objects present to our senses.

§ 22. *Our Ignorance great.*

OUR knowledge being so narrow, as I have showed, it will perhaps give us some light into the present state of our minds, if we look a little into the dark side, and take a view of *our ignorance* : which being infinitely larger than our knowledge, may serve much to the quieting of disputes, and improvement of useful knowledge ; if discovering how far we have clear and distinct *ideas*, we confine our thoughts within the contemplation of those things that are within the reach of our understandings, and launch not out into that abyss of darkness (where we have not eyes to see, nor faculties to perceive any thing) out of a presumption, that nothing is beyond our comprehension. But to be satisfied of the folly of such a conceit, we need not go far. He that knows any thing, knows this in the first place, that he need not seek long for instances of his ignorance. The meanest and most obvious things that come in our way, have dark sides, that the quickest sight cannot penetrate into. The clearest and most enlarged understandings of thinking men find themselves puzzled, and at a loss, in every particle of matter. We shall the less wonder to find it so, when we consider the *causes of our ignorance* ; which, from what has been said, I suppose, will be found to be chiefly these three :

First, Want of *ideas*.

Secondly, Want of a discoverable connection between the *ideas* we have.

Thirdly, Want of tracing and examining our *ideas*.

§ 23. *First*, One cause of it want of *Ideas*, either such as we have no conception of, or such as particularly we have not.

FIRST, There are some things, and those not a few, that we are ignorant of for want of *ideas*.

First, All the simple *ideas* we have, are confined (as I have shown) to those we receive from corporeal objects by *sensation*, and from the operations of our own minds as the objects of *reflection*. But how much these few and narrow inlets are disproportionate to the vast whole extent of all beings, will not be hard to persuade those who are not so foolish as to think their span the measure of all things. What other simple *ideas* it is possible the creatures in other parts of the universe may have, by the assistance of senses and faculties more or perfecter than we have, or different from ours, it is not for us to determine. But to say, or think there are no such, because we conceive nothing of them, is no better an argument, than if a blind man should be positive in it, that there was no such thing as sight and colours, because he had no manner of *idea* of any such thing, nor could by any means frame to himself any notion about seeing. The ignorance and darkness that is in us, no more hinders nor confines the knowledge that is in others, than the blindness of a mole is an argument against the quick-sightedness of an eagle. He that will consider the infinite power, wisdom, and goodness of the Creator of all things, will find reason to think, it was not all laid out upon so inconsiderable, mean, and impotent a creature as he will find man to be; who, in all probability, is one of the lowest of all intellectual beings. What faculties therefore other species of creatures have to penetrate into the nature and inmost constitutions of things, what *ideas* they may receive of them, far different from ours, we know not. This we know, and certainly find, that we want several other views of them, besides those we have, to make discoveries of them more perfect. And we may be convinced that the *ideas* we can attain to by our faculties, are very disproportionate to things themselves, when a positive clear distinct one of substance itself, which is the foundation of all the rest, is concealed from us. But want of *ideas* of this kind being a part as well as cause of our ignorance, cannot be described. Only this, I

think, I may confidently say of it, that the intellectual and sensible world, are in this perfectly alike; that that part, which we see of either of them, holds no proportion with what we see not; and whatsoever we can reach with our eyes, or our thoughts, of either of them, is but a point, almost nothing in comparison of the rest.

§ 24. *Because of their Remoteness.*

SECONDLY, Another great cause of ignorance is the *want of ideas we are capable of*. As the want of *ideas*, which our faculties are not able to give us, shuts us wholly from those views of things, which it is reasonable to think other beings, perfecter than we, have, of which we know nothing; so the want of *ideas* I now speak of, keeps us in ignorance of things we conceive capable of being known to us. *Bulk, figure, and motion*, we have *ideas* of. But though we are not without *ideas* of these primary qualities of bodies in general, yet not knowing what is the particular *bulk, figure, and motion*, of the greatest part of the bodies of the universe, we are ignorant of the several powers, efficacies, and ways of operation, whereby the effects, which we daily see, are produced. These are hid from us in some things, by being *too remote*; and in others, by being *too minute*. When we consider the vast distance of the known and visible parts of the world, and the reasons we have to think, that what lies within our ken, is but a small part of the immense universe, we shall then discover an huge abyss of ignorance. What are the particular fabrics of the great masses of matter, which make up the whole stupendous frame of corporeal beings, how far they are extended, what is their motion, and how continued or communicated, and what influence they have one upon another, are contemplations that at first glimpse our thoughts lose themselves in. If we narrow our contemplation, and confine our thoughts to this little canton, I mean this system of our sun, and the grosser masses of matter, that visibly move about it; what several sorts of vegetables, animals, and intellectual

corporeal beings, infinitely different from those of our little spot of earth, may there probably be in the other planets, to the knowledge of which, even of their outward figures and parts, we can no way attain, whilst we are confined to this earth; there being no natural means, either by sensation or reflection, to convey their certain *ideas* into our minds? They are out of the reach of those inlets of all our knowledge: and what sorts of furniture and inhabitants those mansions contain in them, we cannot so much as guess, much less have clear and distinct *ideas* of them.

§ 25. *Because of their Minuteness.*

IF a great, nay, far the greatest part of the several ranks of *bodies* in the universe, escape our notice by their remoteness, there are others that are no less concealed from us by their *minuteness*. These insensible corpuscles being the active parts of matter, and the great instruments of nature, on which depend not only all their secondary qualities, but also most of their natural operations; our want of precise distinct *ideas* of their primary qualities, keeps us in an incurable ignorance of what we desire to know about them. I doubt not but if we could discover the figure, size, texture, and motion of the minute constituent parts of any two bodies, we should know without trial several of their operations one upon another, as we do now the properties of a square or a triangle. Did we know the mechanical affections of the particles of *rhubarb*, *hemlock*, *opium*, and a *man*, as a watchmaker, does those of a watch, whereby it performs its operations, and of a file, which by rubbing on them will alter the figure of any of the wheels; we should be able to tell beforehand, that *rhubarb* will purge, *hemlock* kill, and *opium* make a man sleep, as well as a watchmaker can, that a little piece of paper laid on the balance will keep the watch from going, till it be removed; or that some small part of it being rubbed by a file, the machine would quite lose its motion, and the watch go no more. The dissolving of silver in *aqua fortis*, and gold in *aqua regia*, and not vice

versa, would be then perhaps no more difficult to know, than it is to a smith to understand why the turning of one key will open a lock, and not the turning of another. But whilst we are destitute of senses acute enough to discover the minute particles of bodies, and to give us *ideas* of their mechanical affections, we must be content to be ignorant of their properties and ways of operation; nor can we be assured about them any farther, than some few trials we make, are able to reach. But whether they will succeed again another time, we cannot be certain. This hinders our certain knowledge of universal truths concerning natural bodies: and our reason carries us herein very little beyond particular matter of fact.

§ 26. *Hence no Science of Bodies.*

AND therefore I am apt to doubt, that how far soever human industry may advance useful and *experimental* philosophy in *physical things*, *scientific* will still be out of our reach; because we want perfect and adequate *ideas* of those very bodies which are nearest to us, and most under our command. Those which we have ranked into classes under names, and we think ourselves best acquainted with, we have but very imperfect and incomplete *ideas* of. Distinct *ideas* of the several sorts of bodies that fall under the examination of our senses, perhaps we may have: but adequate *ideas*, I suspect we have not of any one amongst them. And though the former of these will serve us for common use and discourse, yet whilst we want the latter, we are not capable of *scientific knowledge*; nor shall ever be able to discover general, instructive, unquestionable truths concerning them. *Certainty* and *demonstration* are things we must not, in these matters, pretend to. By the colour, figure, taste, and smell, and other sensible qualities, we have as clear and distinct *ideas* of sage and hemlock, as we have of a circle and a triangle: But having no *ideas* of the particular primary qualities of the minute parts of either of these plants, nor of other bodies which we would apply them to, we cannot tell what effects they will pro-

duce ; nor when we see those effects, can we so much as guess, much less know, their manner of production. Thus having no *ideas* of the particular mechanical affections of the minute parts of bodies that are within our view and reach, we are ignorant of their constitutions, powers, and operations : and of bodies more remote, we are yet more ignorant, not knowing so much as their very outward shapes, or the sensible and grosser parts of their constitutions.

§ 27. *Much less of Spirits.*

THIS, at first sight, will show us how disproportionate our knowledge is to the whole extent even of material beings ; to which if we add the consideration of that infinite number of *spirits* that may be, and probably are, which are yet more remote from our knowledge, whereof we have no cognizance, nor can frame to ourselves any distinct *ideas* of their several ranks and sorts, we shall find this cause of ignorance conceal from us, in an impenetrable obscurity, almost the whole intellectual world ; a greater certainly, and more beautiful world than the material. For bating some very few, and those, if I may so call them, superficial *ideas* of spirit, which by reflection we get of our own, and from thence the best we can collect of the Father of all spirits, the eternal independent Author of them and us and all things ; we have no certain information, so much as of the existence of other spirits, but by revelation. Angels of all sorts are naturally beyond our discovery : And all those intelligences, whereof it is likely there are more orders than of corporeal substances, are things whereof our natural faculties give us no certain account at all. That there are minds and thinking beings in other men as well as himself, every man has a reason, from their words and actions, to be satisfied : And the knowledge of his own mind cannot suffer a man, that considers, to be ignorant, that there is a God. But that there are degrees of spiritual beings between us and the great God, who is there that by his own search and ability can come to know ? Much less have we dis-

distinct *ideas* of their different natures, conditions, states, powers, and several constitutions, wherein they agree or differ from one another, and from us. And therefore in what concerns their different species and properties, we are under an absolute ignorance.

§ 28. *Secondly, Want of a discoverable Connection between Ideas we have.*

SECONDLY, What a small part of the substantial beings that are in the universe, the want of *ideas* leave open to our knowledge, we have seen. In the next place, another cause of ignorance, of no less moment, is a want of a *discoverable connection* between those *ideas* we have: For wherever we want that, we are utterly incapable of universal and certain knowledge; and are, as in the former case, left only to observation and experiment: which, how narrow and confined it is, how far from general knowledge, we need not be told. I shall give some few instances of this cause of our ignorance, and so leave it. It is evident that the bulk, figure, and motion of several bodies about us, produce in us several sensations, as of colours, sounds, tastes, smells, pleasure and pain, &c. These mechanical affections of bodies having no affinity at all with those *ideas* they produce in us (there being no conceivable connection between any impulse of any sort of body, and any perception of a colour, or smell, which we find in our minds), we can have no distinct knowledge of such operations beyond our experience, and can reason no otherwise about them, than as effects produced by the appointment of an infinitely wise Agent, which perfectly surpasses our comprehensions. As the *ideas* of sensible secondary qualities which we have in our minds, can by us be no way deduced from bodily causes, nor any correspondence or connection be found between them and those primary qualities which (experience shows us) produce them in us: so on the other side, the operation of our minds upon our bodies is as unconceivable. How any thought should produce a motion in body, is as remote from the nature of our *ideas*, as how any bo-

dy should produce any thought in the mind. That it is so, if experience did not convince us, the consideration of the things themselves would never be able in the least to discover to us. These, and the like, though they have a constant and regular connection, in the ordinary course of things, yet that connection being not discoverable in the *ideas* themselves, which appearing to have no necessary dependence one on another, we can attribute their connection to nothing else but the arbitrary determination of that all-wise Agent, who has made them to be, and to operate as they do, in a way wholly above our weak understandings to conceive.

§ 29. *Instances.*

IN some of our *ideas* there are certain relations, habits, and connections, so visibly included in the nature of the *ideas* themselves, that we cannot conceive them separable from them by any power whatsoever. And in these only we are capable of certain and universal knowledge. Thus the *idea* of a right-lined triangle necessarily carries with it an equality of its angles to two right ones. Nor can we conceive this relation, this connection of these two *ideas*, to be possibly mutable, or to depend on any arbitrary power, which of choice made it thus, or could make it otherwise. But the coherence and continuity of the parts of matter; the production of sensation in us of colours and sounds, &c. by impulse and motion; nay, the original rules and communication of motion being such, wherein we can discover no natural connection with any *ideas* we have, we cannot but ascribe them to the arbitrary will and good pleasure of the wise Architect. I need not, I think, here mention the resurrection of the dead, the future state of this globe of earth, and such other things, which are by every one acknowledged to depend wholly on the determination of a free Agent. The things that, as far as our observation reaches, we constantly find to proceed regularly, we may conclude do act by a law set them, but yet by a law that we know not: whereby, though

causes work steadily, and effects constantly flow from them, yet their *connections* and *dependencies* being not discoverable in our *ideas*, we can have but an experimental knowledge of them. From all which it is easy to perceive what a darkness we are involved in, how little it is of being, and the things that are, that we are capable to know. And therefore we shall do no injury to our knowledge, when we modestly think with ourselves, that we are so far from being able to comprehend the whole nature of the universe, and all the things contained in it, that we are not capable of a philosophical *knowledge* of the bodies that are about us, and make a part of us: concerning their secondary qualities, powers, and operations, we can have no universal certainty. Several effects come every day within the notice of our senses, of which we have so far *sensitive knowledge*; but the causes, manner, and certainty of their production, for the two foregoing reasons, we must be content to be ignorant of. In these we can go no farther than particular experience informs us of matter of fact, and by analogy, to guess what effects the like bodies are, upon other trials, like to produce. But as to a perfect *science* of natural bodies (not to mention spiritual beings) we are, I think, so far from being capable of any such thing, that I conclude it lost labour to seek after it.

§ 30. *Thirdly, Want of tracing our Ideas.*

THIRDLY, Where we have adequate *ideas*, and where there is a certain and discoverable connection between them, yet we are often ignorant, for want of *tracing* those *ideas* which we have, or may have; and for want of finding out those intermediate *ideas*, which may show us what habitude of agreement or disagreement they have one with another. And thus many are ignorant of mathematical truths, not out of any imperfection of their faculties, or uncertainty in the things themselves; but for want of application in acquiring, examining, and by due ways comparing those *ideas*. That which has most contributed to hinder the due *tracing* of our *ideas*, and finding out their rela-

tions, and agreements or disagreements one with another, has been, I suppose, the ill use of *words*. It is impossible that men should ever truly seek or certainly discover the agreement or disagreement of *ideas* themselves, whilst their thoughts flutter about, or stick only in sounds of doubtful and uncertain significations. Mathematicians abstracting their thoughts from names, and accustoming themselves to set before their minds the *ideas* themselves that they would consider, and not sounds instead of them, have avoided thereby a great part of that perplexity, puddering, and confusion, which has so much hindered mens progress in other parts of knowledge. For whilst they stick in words of undetermined and uncertain signification, they are unable to distinguish true from false, certain from probable, consistent from inconsistent, in their own opinions. This having been the fate or misfortune of a great part of the men of letters, the increase brought into the stock of real knowledge, has been very little, in proportion to the schools, disputes, and writings, the world has been filled with; whilst students, being lost in the great wood of words, knew not whereabouts they were, how far their discoveries were advanced, or what was wanting in their own or the general stock of knowledge. Had men in the discoveries of the material, done as they have in those of the intellectual world, involved all in the obscurity of uncertain and doubtful ways of talking. Volumes writ of navigation and voyages, theories and stories of zones and tides, multiplied and disputed; nay, ships built, and fleets set out, would never have taught us the way beyond the line; and the Antipodes would be still as much unknown, as when it was declared heresy to hold there were any. But having spoken sufficiently of words, and the ill or careless use that is commonly made of them, I shall not say any thing more of it here.

§ 31. *Extent in respect of Universality.* 1754

HITHERTO we have examined the *extent* of our knowledge, in respect of the several sorts of beings that are

There is another *extent* of it, in *respect of universality*, which will also deserve to be considered; and in this regard, our knowledge follows the nature of our *ideas*. If the *ideas* are abstract, whose agreement or disagreement we perceive, our knowledge is universal. For what is known of such general *ideas*, will be true of every particular thing, in whom that essence, *i. e.* that abstract *idea* is to be found; and what is once known of such *ideas*, will be perpetually and forever true. So that as to all general knowledge, we must search and find it only in our own minds, and it is only the examining of our own *ideas*, that furnisheth us with that. Truths belonging to essences of things (that is, to abstract *ideas*) are eternal, and are to be found out by the contemplation only of those essences: as the existence of things is to be known only from experience. But having more to say of this in the chapters where I shall speak of general and real knowledge, this may here suffice as to the universality of our knowledge in general.

CHAP. IV.

OF THE REALITY OF KNOWLEDGE.

§ 1. *Obj. Knowledge placed in Ideas may be all bare Vision:*

I DOUBT not but my reader by this time may be apt to think, that I have been all this while only building a castle in the air; and be ready to say to me, To what purpose all this stir? Knowledge, say you, is only the perception of the agreement or disagreement of our own *ideas*: but who knows what those *ideas* may be? Is there any thing so extravagant, as the imaginations of mens brains? where is the head that has no *chimeras* in it? Or, if there be a sober and a wise man, what difference will there be, by your rules, between his knowledge and that of the most extravagant fancy in the world? They both have their *ideas*, and perceive their agreement and disagreement one

with another. If there be any difference between them, the advantage will be on the warm-headed man's side, as having the more *ideas*, and the more lively: And so, by your rules, he will be the more knowing. If it be true, that all knowledge lies only in the perception of the agreement or disagreement of our own *ideas*, the visions of an enthusiast, and the reasonings of a sober man, will be equally certain. It is no matter how things are, so a man observe but the agreement of his own imaginations and talk conformably, it is all truth, all certainty. Such castles in the air, will be as strong holds of truth, as the demonstrations of Euclid. That an harpy is not a centaur, is by this way as certain knowledge, and as much a truth, as that a square is not a circle.

But of *what use is all this fine knowledge of mens own imaginations*, to a man that inquires after the reality of things? It matters not what mens fancies are, it is the knowledge of things that is only to be prized; it is this alone gives a value to our reasonings, and preference to one man's knowledge over another's, that it is of things as they really are, and not of dreams and fancies.

§ 2. *Answ. Not so, where Ideas agree with Things.* To which I answer, That if our knowledge of our *ideas* terminate in them, and reach no farther, where there is something farther intended, our most serious thoughts will be of little more use, than the reveries of a crazy brain; and the truths built thereon of no more weight, than the discourses of a man who sees things clearly in a dream, and with great assurance utters them. But, I hope, before I have done, to make it evident, that this way of certainty, by the knowledge of our own *ideas*, goes a little farther than bare imagination: and, I believe it will appear, that all the certainty of general truths a man has, lies in nothing else.

§ 3. *Answ. Not so, where Ideas agree with Things.* It is evident, the mind knows not things immediately, but only by the intervention of the *ideas* it has of

them. Our knowledge therefore is *real*, only so far as there is a conformity between our *ideas* and the reality of things. But what shall be here the criterion? How shall the mind, when it perceives nothing but its own *ideas*, know that they agree with things themselves? This, though it seems not to want difficulty, yet, I think, there be two sorts of *ideas*, that, we may be assured, agree with things.

§ 4. *As, 1. All simple Ideas do.*

FIRST, The first are simple *ideas*, which since the mind, as has been shewed, can by no means make to itself, must necessarily be the product of things operating on the mind in a natural way, and producing therein those perceptions which by the wisdom and will of our Maker they are ordained and adapted to. From whence it follows, that *simple ideas are not fictions* of our fancies, but the natural and regular productions of things without us, really operating upon us, and so carry with them all the conformity which is intended, or which our state requires: For they represent to us things under those appearances which they are fitted to produce in us, whereby we are enabled to distinguish the sorts of particular substances, to discern the states they are in, and so to take them for our necessities, and apply them to our uses. Thus the *idea* of whiteness, or bitterness, as it is in the mind, exactly answering that power which is in any body to produce it there, has all the real conformity it can, or ought to have, with things without us. And this conformity between our simple *ideas*, and the existence of things, is sufficient for real knowledge.

§ 5. *All complex Ideas, except of Substances.*

SECONDLY, All our complex *Ideas*, except those of *substances*, being *archetypes* of the mind's own making, not intended to be the copies of any thing, nor referred to the existence of any thing, as to their originals, cannot want any conformity necessary to real knowledge. For that which is not designed to represent any thing but itself, can never be capable of a wrong representation, nor mislead us from the true

apprehension of any thing, by its dislikeness to it; and such, excepting those of substances, are all our complex *ideas*: which, as I have showed in another place, are combinations of *ideas* which the mind, by its free choice, puts together, without considering any connection they have in nature. And hence it is, that in all these sorts the *ideas* themselves are considered as the *archetypes*, and things no otherwise regarded, but as they are conformable to them. So that we cannot but be infallibly certain, that all the knowledge we attain concerning these *ideas*, is real, and reaches things themselves; because in all our thoughts, reasonings and discourses of this kind, we intend things no farther than as they are conformable to our *ideas*. So that in these we cannot miss of a certain and undoubted reality.

§ 6. Hence the Reality of Mathematical Knowledge. I DOUBT not but it will be easily granted, that the knowledge we have of *mathematical truths*, is not only certain, but *real knowledge*; and not the bare empty vision of vain insignificant *chimeras* of the brain: and yet, if we will consider, we shall find that it is only of our own *ideas*. The mathematician considers the truth and properties belonging to a rectangle, or circle, only as they are in *idea* in his own mind. For it is possible he never found either of them existing mathematically, *i. e.* precisely true, in his life. But yet the knowledge he has of any truths or properties belonging to a circle, or any other mathematical figure, are nevertheless true and certain, even of real things existing; because real things are no farther concerned, nor intended to be meant by any such propositions, than as things really agree to those *archetypes* in his mind. Is it true of the *idea* of a triangle, that its three angles are equal to two right ones? It is true also of a *triangle*, wherever it really exists. Whatever other figure exists, that is not exactly answerable to that *idea* of a triangle in his mind, is not at all concerned in that proposition; and therefore he is certain all his knowledge concerning such *ideas*, is

real knowledge ; because intending things no farther than they agree with those his *ideas*, he is sure what he knows concerning those figures, when they have barely an *ideal existence* in his mind, will hold true of them also, when they have a real existence in matter ; his consideration being barely of those figures, which are the same, wherever or however they exist.

§ 7. *And of Moral.*

AND hence it follows, that *moral knowledge* is as capable of real certainty, as mathematics. For certainty being but the perception of the agreement or disagreement of our *ideas* ; and demonstration nothing but the perception of such agreement, by the intervention of other *ideas*, or mediums ; our *moral ideas*, as well as mathematical, being *archetypes* themselves, and so adequate and complete *ideas* ; all the agreement or disagreement, which we shall find in them, will produce real knowledge, as well as in mathematical figures.

§ 8. *Existence not required to make it real.*

FOR the attaining of *knowledge* and certainty, it is requisite that we have determined *ideas* ; and to make our knowledge *real*, it is requisite that the *ideas* answer their *archetypes*. Nor let it be wondered, that I place the certainty of our knowledge in the consideration of our *ideas*, with so little care and regard (as it may seem) to the real existence of things : since most of those discourses, which take up the thoughts, and engage the disputes of those who pretend to make it their business to inquire after truth and certainty, will, I presume, upon examination, be found to be *general propositions*, and notions in which existence is not at all concerned. All the discourses of the mathematicians about the squaring of a circle, conic sections, or any other part of mathematics, concern not the *existence* of any of those figures ; but their demonstrations, which depend on their *ideas*, are the same, whether there be any square or circle existing in the world, or no. In the same manner, the truth and certainty of *moral* discourses abstracts from the lives

of men, and the existence of those virtues in the world whereof they treat. Nor are Tully's Offices less true, because there is no body in the world that exactly practises his rules, and lives up to that pattern of a virtuous man which he has given us, and which existed no where, when he writ, but in *idea*. If it be true in speculation, *i. e.* in *idea*, that *murder deserves death*, it will also be true in reality of any action that exists conformable to that *idea* of *murder*. As for other actions, the truth of that proposition concerns them not. And thus it is of all other species of things, which have no other essence but those *ideas* which are in the minds of men.

§ 9. *Nor will it be less true or certain, because moral Ideas are of our own making and naming.*

BUT it will here be said, that if *moral knowledge* be placed in the contemplation of our own *moral ideas*, and those, as other modes, be of our own making, what strange notions will there be of *justice* and *temperance*? What confusion of virtues and vices, if every one may make what *ideas* of them he pleases? No confusion nor disorder in the things themselves, nor the reasonings about them; no more than (in mathematics) there would be a disturbance in the demonstration, or a change in the properties of figures, and their relations one to another, if a man should make a triangle with four corners, or a *trapezium* with four right angles; that is, in plain English, change the names of the figures, and call that by one name, which mathematicians call ordinarily by another. For let a man make to himself the *idea* of a figure with three angles, whereof one is a right one, and call it, if he please, *equilaterum* or *trapezium*, or any thing else, the properties of, and demonstrations about that *idea* will be the same, as if he called it a *rectangular triangle*. I confess the change of the name, by the impropriety of speech, will at first disturb him, who knows not what *idea* it stands for; but as soon as the figure is drawn, the consequences and demonstration are plain and clear. Just the same is it in *moral*

knowledge, let a man have the *idea* of taking from others, without their consent, what their honest industry has possessed them of, and call this *justice*, if he please. He that takes the name here without the *idea* put to it will be mistaken, by joining another *idea* of his own to that name: but strip the *idea* of that name, or take it such as it is in the speaker's mind, and the same things will agree to it, as if you called it *injustice*. Indeed wrong names in moral discourses breed usually more disorder, because they are not so easily rectified as in mathematics, where the figure once drawn and seen, makes the name useless and of no force. For what need of a sign, when the thing signified is present and in view? But in moral names, that cannot be so easily and shortly done, because of the many decompositions that go to the making up the complex *ideas* of those modes. But yet for all this, *miscalling* of any of those *ideas*, contrary to the usual signification of the words of that language, hinders not, but that we may have certain and demonstrative knowledge of their several agreements and disagreements, if we will carefully, as in mathematics, keep to the same precise *ideas*, and trace them in their several relations one to another, without being led away by their names. If we but separate the *idea* under consideration from the sign that stands for it, our knowledge goes equally on in the discovery of real truth and certainty, whatever sounds we make use of.

§ 10. *Misnaming disturbs not the Certainty of the Knowledge.*

ONE thing more we are to take notice of, that where God, or any other law maker, hath defined any moral names, there they have made the essence of that species to which that name belongs; and there it is not safe to apply or use them otherwise: but in other cases, it is bare impropriety of speech to apply them contrary to the common usage of the country. But yet even this too disturbs not the certainty of that knowledge, which is still to be had by a due contemplation, and comparing of those even nick-named *ideas*.

§ 11. *Ideas of Substances have their Archetypes without us.*

THIRDLY, There is another sort of *complex ideas*, which being referred to *archetypes* without us, may differ from them, and so our knowledge about them may come short of being real. Such are our *ideas* of substances, which consisting of a collection of simple *ideas*, supposed taken from the works of nature, may yet vary from them, by having more or different *ideas* united in them, than are to be found united in things themselves. From whence it comes to pass, that they may, and often do fail of being exactly conformable to things themselves.

§ 12. *So far as they agree with those, so far our Knowledge concerning them is real.*

I SAY then, that to have *ideas* of *substances*, which, by being conformable to things, may afford us *real* knowledge, it is not enough, as in modes, to put together such *ideas* as have no inconsistency, though they did never before so exist: v. g. the *ideas* of *sacrilege* or *perjury*, &c. were as real and true *ideas* before, as after the existence of any such fact. But our *ideas* of *substances* being supposed copies, and referred to *archetypes* without us, must still be taken from something that does or has existed; they must not consist of *ideas* put together at the pleasure of our thoughts, without any real pattern they were taken from, though we can perceive no inconsistency in such a combination. The reason whereof is, because we, knowing not what real constitution it is of substances whereon our simple *ideas* depend, and which really is the cause of the strict union of some of them one with another, and the exclusion of others; there are very few of them, that we can be sure are, or are not inconsistent in nature, any farther than experience and sensible observation reach. Herein therefore is founded the *reality* of our knowledge concerning *substances*, that all our complex *ideas* of them must be such, and such only, as are made up of such simple ones as have been discovered to co-exist in nature. And our *ideas* being thus true,

though not perhaps very exact copies, are yet the subjects of *real* (as far as we have any) *knowledge* of them ; which (as has been already shown) will not be found to reach very far : but so far as it does, it will still be *real knowledge*. Whatever *ideas* we have, the agreement we find they have with others, will still be knowledge. If those *ideas* be abstract, it will be general knowledge. But to make it *real* concerning substances, the *ideas* must be taken from the real existence of things. Whatever simple *ideas* have been found to co-exist in any substance, these we may with confidence join together again, and so make abstract *ideas* of substances. For whatever have once had an union in nature, may be united again.

§ 13. *In our Inquiries about Substances, we must consider Ideas, and not confine our Thoughts to Names or Species supposed set out by Names.*

THIS, if we rightly consider, and *confine not our thoughts* and abstract *ideas* to names, as if there were, or could be no other *sorts* of things than what known names had already determined, and as it were set out, we should think of things with greater freedom and less confusion than perhaps we do. It would possibly be thought a bold paradox, if not a very dangerous falsehood, if I should say, that some *changelings*, who have lived forty years together without any appearance of reason, are something between a man and a beast : Which prejudice is founded upon nothing else but a false supposition, that these two names, *man* and *beast*, stand for distinct species to set out by real essences, that there can come no other species between them. Whereas if we will abstract from those names, and the supposition of such specific essences made by nature, wherein all things of the same denominations did exactly and equally partake ; if we would not fancy that there were a certain number of these essences, wherein all things, as in molds, were cast and formed, we should find that the *idea* of the shape, motion, and life of a man without reason, is as much a distinct *idea*, and makes as much a distinct *sort* of things from

man and beast, as the *idea* of the shape of an *ass* with reason, would be different from either that of man or beast, and be a species of an animal between, or distinct from both.

§ 14. *Objection against a Changeling, being something between a Man and Beast, answered.*

HERE every body will be ready to ask, if *changelings* may be supposed something between man and beast, pray what are they? I answer, *changelings*, which is as good a word to signify something different from the signification of *man* or *beast*, as the names man and beast are to have significations different one from the other. This, well considered, would resolve this matter, and show my meaning without any more ado. But I am not so unacquainted with the zeal of some men, which enables them to spin consequences, and to see religion threatened whenever any one ventures to quit their forms of speaking, as not to foresee what names such a proposition as this is like to be charged with: and without doubt it will be asked, if *changelings* are something between man and beast, what will become of them in the other world? To which I answer, 1. It concerns me not to know or inquire. To their own master they stand or fall. It will make their state neither better nor worse, whether we determine any thing of it or no. They are in the hands of a faithful Creator and a bountiful Father, who disposes not of his creatures according to our narrow thoughts or opinions, nor distinguishes them according to names and species of our contrivance. And we that know so little of this present world we are in, may, I think, content ourselves without being peremptory in defining the different states, which creatures shall come into when they go off this stage. It may suffice us, that he hath made known to all those, who are capable of instruction, discourse and reasoning, that they shall come to an account, and receive according to what they have done in this body.

§ 15.

BUT, *secondly*, I answer, the force of these mens ques-

tion, (*viz.* will you deprive *changelings* of a future state)? is founded on one of these two suppositions, which are both false. The first is, that all things that have the outward shape and appearance of a man must necessarily be designed to an immortal future being after this life: Or, secondly, that whatever is of human birth must be so. Take away these imaginations, and such questions will be groundless and ridiculous. I desire then those who think there is no more but an accidental difference between themselves and *changelings*, the essence in both being exactly the same, to consider whether they can imagine immortality annexed to any outward shape of the body; the very proposing it, is, I suppose, enough to make them disown it. No one yet, that ever I heard of, how much soever immersed in matter, allowed that excellency to any figure of the gross sensible outward parts, as to affirm eternal life due to it, or a necessary consequence of it; or that any mass of matter should, after its dissolution here, be again restored hereafter to an everlasting state of sense, perception, and knowledge, only because it was molded into this or that figure, and had such a particular frame of its visible parts. Such an opinion as this, placing immortality in a certain superficial figure, turns out of doors all consideration of soul or spirit, upon whose account alone, some corporeal beings have hitherto been concluded immortal, and others not. This is to attribute more to the outside than inside of things; to place the excellency of a man more in the external shape of his body, than internal perfections of his soul: which is but little better than to annex the great and inestimable advantage of immortality and life everlasting, which he has above other material beings; to annex it, I say to the cut of his beard, or the fashion of his coat. For this or that outward make of our bodies no more carries with it the hopes of an eternal duration, than the fashion of a man's suit gives him reasonable grounds to imagine it will never wear out, or that it will make him immortal. It will perhaps be said, that no body thinks

that the shape makes any thing immortal, but it is the shape is the sign of a rational soul within, which is immortal. I wonder who made it the sign of any such thing; for barely saying it, will not make it so. It would require some proofs to persuade one of it. No figure that I know speaks any such language. For it may as rationally be concluded, that the dead body of a man, wherein there is to be found no more appearance or action of life than there is in a statue, has yet nevertheless a living soul in it, because of its shape; as that there is a rational soul in a *changeling*, because he has the outside of a rational creature, when his actions carry far less marks of reason with them, in the whole course of his life, than what are to be found in many a beast.

§ 16. *Monsters.*

BUT it is the issue of rational parents, and must therefore be concluded to have a rational soul. I know not by what logic you must so conclude. I am sure this is a conclusion, that men no where allow of. For if they did, they would not make bold, as every where they do, to destroy ill-formed and misshaped productions. Ay, but these are *monsters*. Let them be so; what will your driveling, unintelligent, untractable *changeling* be? Shall a defect in the body make a *monster*: a defect in the mind (the far more noble, and in the common phrase, the far more essential part) not? Shall the want of a nose or a neck make a *monster*, and put such issue out of the rank of men; the want of reason and understanding, not? This is to bring all back again to what was exploded just now: This is to place all in the shape, and to take the measure of a man only by his outside. To show that, according to the ordinary way of reasoning in this matter, people do lay the whole stress on the figure, and resolve the whole essence of the species of men (as they make it) into the outward shape, how unreasonable soever it be, and how much soever they disown it; we need but trace their thoughts and practice a little farther and then it will plainly appear. The well shaped

changeling is a man, has a rational soul, though it appear not; this is past doubt, say you. Make the ears a little longer, and more pointed, and the nose a little flatter than ordinary, and then you begin to boggle: Make the face yet narrower, flatter and longer, and then you are at a stand: add still more and more of the likeness of a brute to it, and let the head be perfectly that of some other animal, then presently it is a *monster*: and it is demonstration with you that it hath no rational soul, and must be destroyed. Where now (I ask) shall be the just measure of the utmost bounds of that shape, that carries with it a rational soul? For since there have been human *fætus's* produced, half beast and half man; and others three parts one, and one part the other; and so it is possible they may be in all the variety of approaches to the one or the other shape, and may have several degrees of mixture of the likeness of a man or a brute; I would gladly know what are those precise lineaments, which according to this hypothesis, are, or are not capable of a rational soul to be joined to them? What sort of outside is the certain sign that there is, or is not such an inhabitant within? For till that be done, we talk at random of *man*: and shall always, I fear, do so, as long as we give ourselves up to certain sounds, and the imaginations of settled and fixed species in nature, we know not what. But after all, I desire it may be considered, that those who think they have answered the difficulty by telling us, that a mishaped *fætus* is a *monster*, run into the same fault they are arguing against, by constituting a species between man and beast. For what else, I pray, is their monster in the case (if the word *monster* signifies any thing at all) but something neither man nor beast, but partaking somewhat of either? And just so is the *changeling* before mentioned. So necessary is it to quit the common notion of species and essences, if we will truly look into the nature of things, and examine them, by what our faculties can discover in them as they exist, and not by

groundless fancies, that have been taken up about them.

§ 17. *Words and Species.*

I HAVE mentioned this here, because I think we cannot be too cautious that *words* and *species*, in the ordinary notions which we have been used to of them, impose not upon us. For I am apt to think, therein lies one great obstacle to our clear and distinct knowledge, especially in reference to substances; and from thence has rose a great part of the difficulties about truth and certainty. Would we accustom ourselves to separate our contemplations and reasonings from words, we might, in a great measure, remedy this inconvenience within our own thoughts: but yet it would still disturb us in our discourse with others, as long as we retained the opinion, that *species* and their essences were any thing else but our abstract *ideas* (such as they are) with names annexed to them, to be the signs of them.

§ 18. *Recapitulation.*

WHEREVER we perceive the agreement or disagreement of any of our *ideas*, there is certain knowledge: and wherever we are sure those *ideas* agree with the reality of things, there is certain real knowledge. Of which agreement of our *ideas* with the reality of things, having here given the marks, I think I have shown wherein it is, that *certainty*, *real certainty* consists: which, whatever it was to others, was, I confess, to me heretofore, one of those *desiderata* which I found great want of.

CHAP. V.

OF TRUTH IN GENERAL.

§ 1. *What Truth is.*

WHAT is *truth*, was an inquiry many ages since; and it being that which all mankind either do, or pretend to search after, it cannot but be worth our while carefully to examine wherein it con-

sists, and so acquaint ourselves with the nature of it, as to observe how the mind distinguishes it from falsehood.

§ 2. *A right joining or separating of Signs ; i. e. Ideas or Words.*

TRUTH then seems to me in, the proper import of the word, to signify nothing but *the joining or separating of signs, as the things signified by them, do agree or disagree one with another.* The *joining or separating* of signs here meant, is what by another name we call proposition. So that truth properly belongs only to propositions : whereof there are two sorts, *viz.* mental and verbal ; as there are two sorts of signs commonly made use of, *viz.* *ideas* and words.

§ 3. *Which make mental or verbal Propositions.*

To form a clear notion of *truth*, it is very necessary to consider *truth* of thought, and *truth* of words, distinctly one from another : but yet it is very difficult to treat of them asunder. Because it is unavoidable, in treating of mental propositions, to make use of words : and then the instances given of *mental propositions* cease immediately to be barely mental, and become *verbal*. For a *mental proposition* being nothing but a bare consideration of the *ideas*, as they are in our minds stripped of names, they lose the nature of purely *mental propositions*, as soon as they are put into words.

§ 4. *Mental Propositions are very hard to be treated of.*

AND that which makes it yet *harder to treat of mental* and verbal propositions separately, is, that most men, if not all, in their thinking and reasonings within themselves, make use of words instead of *ideas* ; at least when the subject of their meditation contains in it complex *ideas*. Which is a great evidence of the imperfection and uncertainty of our *ideas* of that kind, and may, if attentively made use of, serve for a mark to show us, what are those things we have clear and perfect established *ideas* of, and what not. For if we will curiously observe the way our mind

takes in thinking and reasoning, we shall find, I suppose, that when we make any propositions within our own thoughts about *white* or *black*, *sweet* or *bitter*, a *triangle* or a *circle*, we can and often do frame in our minds the *ideas* themselves, without reflecting on the names. But when we would consider, or make propositions about the more complex *ideas*, as of a *man*, *virtuol*, *fortitude*, *glory*, we usually put the name for the *idea*: because the *ideas* these names stand for, being for the most part imperfect, confused, and undetermined, we reflect on the *names* themselves, because they are more clear, certain and distinct, and readier occur to our thoughts than the pure *ideas*: and so we make use of these words instead of the *ideas* themselves, even when we would meditate and reason within ourselves, and make tacit mental propositions. In *substances*, as has been already noted, this is occasioned by the imperfection of our *ideas*: we making the name stand for the real essence, of which we have no *idea* at all. In *modes*, it is occasioned by the great number of simple *ideas*, that go to the making them up. For many of them being compounded, the *name* occurs much easier than the complex *idea* itself, which requires time and attention to be recollected, and exactly represented to the mind, even in those men who have formerly been at the pains to do it; and is utterly impossible to be done by those, who, though they have ready in their memory the greatest part of the common words of their language, yet perhaps never troubled themselves in all their lives to consider what precise *ideas* the most of them stood for. Some confused or obscure notions have served their turns; and many who talk very much of *religion* and *conscience*, of *church* and *faith*, of *power* and *right*, of *obstructions* and *humours*, *melancholy* and *choler*, would perhaps have little left in their thoughts and meditations, if one should desire them to think only of the things themselves, and lay by those words, with which they so often confound others, and not seldom themselves also.

§ 5. *Being nothing but the joining or separating Ideas without Words.*

BUT to return to the consideration of truth: we must, I say, observe two sorts of propositions that we are capable of making.

First, Mental, wherein the *ideas* in our understandings are without the use of words *put together, or separated* by the mind, perceiving or judging of their agreement or disagreement.

Secondly, Verbal propositions, which are words, the signs of our *ideas*, *put together or separated in affirmative or negative sentences*. By which way of affirming or denying, these signs, made by sounds, are as it were put together or separated one from another. So that proposition consists in joining or separating signs, and truth consists in the putting together or separating those signs according as the things, which they stand for, agree or disagree.

§ 6. *When mental Propositions contain real Truth, and when verbal.*

EVERY one's experience will satisfy him, that the mind, either by perceiving or supposing the agreement or disagreement of any of its *ideas*, does tacitly within itself put them into a kind of proposition affirmative or negative, which I have endeavoured to express by the terms, *putting together* and *separating*. But this action of the mind, which is so familiar to every thinking and reasoning man, is easier to be conceived by reflecting on what passes in us when we affirm or deny, than to be explained by words. When a man has in his mind the *idea* of two lines, *viz.* the *side* and *diagonal* of a square, whereof the diagonal is an inch long, he may have the *idea* also of the division of that line, into a certain number of equal parts; *v. g.* into five, ten, an hundred, a thousand, or any other number, and may have the *idea* of that inch line being divisible or not divisible, into such equal parts, as a certain number of them will be equal to the side-line. Now whenever he perceives, believes, or supposes such a kind of divisibility to agree or disagree to his *idea* of

that line, he, as it were, *joins* or *separates* those two *ideas*, viz. the *idea* of that line, and the *idea* of that kind of divisibility; and so makes a mental proposition, which is true or false, according as such a kind of divisibility, a divisibility into such *aliquot* parts, does really agree to that line or no. When *ideas* are so put together, or separated in the mind, as they, or the things they stand for do agree or not, that is, as I may call it *mental truth*. But *truth of words* is something more; and that is, the affirming or denying of words one of another, as the *ideas* they stand for agree or disagree: and this again is twofold; either *purely verbal* and trifling, which I shall speak of, *chap. 10.* or *real* and instructive; which is the object of that real knowledge which we have spoken of already.

§ 7. *Objection against verbal Truth, that thus it may all be chimerical.*

BUT here again will be apt to occur the same doubt about truth, that did about knowledge: and it will be objected, that if truth be nothing but the joining or separating of words in propositions, as the *ideas* they stand for agree or disagree in mens minds, the knowledge of *truth* is not so valuable a thing as it is taken to be, nor worth the pains and time men employ to the search of it: since by this account it amounts to no more than the conformity of words to the *chimeras* of mens brains. Who knows not what odd notions many mens heads are filled with, and what strange *ideas* all mens brains are capable of? But if we rest here, we know the truth of nothing by this rule, but of the visionary world in our own imaginations; nor have other truth, but what as much concerns *barpies* and *centaurs*, as men and horses. For those, and the like, may be *ideas* in our heads, and have their agreement and disagreement there, as well as the *ideas* of real beings, and so have as true propositions made about them. And it will be altogether as true a proposition, to say all *centaurs* are *animals*, as that all men are *animals*; and the certain-

ty of one as great as the other. For in both the propositions, the words are put together, according to the agreement of the *ideas* in our minds: and the agreement of the *idea* of *animal* with that of *centaur*, is as clear and visible to the mind, as the agreement of the *idea* of *animal* with that of *man*; and so these two propositions are equally true, equally certain. But of what use is all such truth to us?

§ 8. *Answered, Real Truth is about Ideas agreeing to things.*

THOUGH what has been said in the foregoing chapter, to distinguish real from imaginary knowledge, might suffice here, in answer to this doubt, to distinguish *real truth* from *chimerical*, or (if you please) *barely nominal*, they depending both on the same foundation; yet it may not be amiss here again to consider, that though our words signify nothing but our *ideas*, yet being designed by them to signify things, the *truth* they contain, when put into propositions, will be only *verbal*, when they stand for *ideas* in the mind, that have not an agreement with the reality of things. And therefore truth, as well as knowledge, may well come under the distinction of *verbal* and *real*; that being only *verbal truth*, wherein terms are joined according to the agreement or disagreement of the *ideas* they stand for, without regarding whether our *ideas* are such as really have, or are capable of having an existence in nature. But then it is they contain *real truth*, when these signs are joined, as our *ideas* agree; and when our *ideas* are such, as we know are capable of having an existence in nature: which in substances we cannot know, but by knowing that such have existed.

§ 9. *Falsehood is the joining of Names otherwise than their Ideas agree.*

TRUTH is the marking down in words the agreement or disagreement of *ideas* as it is. *Falsehood* is the marking down in words the agreement or disagreement of *ideas* otherwise than it is. And so far as these *ideas*, thus marked by sounds, agree to their archetypes, so far only is the *truth real*. The know-

ledge of this truth consists in knowing what *ideas* the words stand for, and the perception of the agreement or disagreement of those *ideas*, according as it is marked by those words.

§ 10. *General Propositions to be treated of more at large.*

BUT because words are looked on as the great conduits of truth and knowledge, and that in conveying and receiving of truth, and commonly in reasoning about it, we make use of words and propositions, I shall more at large inquire, wherein the certainty of real truths, contained in propositions, consists, and where it is to be had; and endeavour to show in what sort of universal propositions we are capable of being *certain* of their real truth or falsehood.

I shall begin with general propositions, as those which most employ our thoughts, and exercise our contemplation. *General truths* are most looked after by the mind, as those that most enlarge our knowledge; and by their comprehensiveness, satisfying us at once of many particulars, enlarge our view, and shorten our way to knowledge.

§ 11. *Moral and metaphysical Truth.*

BESIDES truth taken in the strict sense before-mentioned, there are other sorts of truths; as, 1. *Moral truth*, which is speaking of things according to the persuasion of our own minds, though the proposition we speak agree not to the reality of things. 2. *Metaphysical truth*, which is nothing but the real existence of things, conformable to the *ideas* to which we have annexed their names. This, though it seems to consist in the very beings of things, yet when considered a little nearly, will appear to include a tacit proposition, whereby the mind joins that particular thing to the *idea* it had before settled with a name to it. But these considerations of truth, either having been before taken notice of, or not being much to our present purpose, it may suffice here only to have mentioned them.

CHAP. VI.

OF UNIVERSAL PROPOSITIONS, THEIR TRUTH AND
CERTAINTY.

§ 1. *Treating of Words necessary to knowledge.*

THOUGH the examining and judging of *ideas* by themselves, their names being quite laid aside, be the best and surest way to clear and distinct knowledge; yet through the prevailing custom of using sounds for *ideas*, I think it is very seldom practised. Every one may observe how common it is for names to be made use of, instead of the *ideas* themselves, even when men think and reason within their own breasts; especially if the *ideas* be very complex, and made up of a great collection of simple ones. This makes *the consideration of words and propositions so necessary a part of the treatise of knowledge*, that it is very hard to speak intelligibly of the one, without explaining the other.

§ 2. *General Truths hardly to be understood, but in verbal Propositions.*

ALL the knowledge we have, being only of particular or *general truths*, it is evident that whatever may be done in the former of these, the latter, which is that which with reason is most sought after, can never be well made known, and is very *seldom apprehended, but as conceived and expressed in words*. It is not therefore out of our way, in the examination of our knowledge, to inquire into the truth and certainty of universal propositions.

§ 3. *Certainty twofold, of Truth and of Knowledge.*

BUT that we may not be misled in this case, by that which is the danger every where, I mean by the doubtfulness of terms, it is fit to observe, that certainty is twofold; *certainty of truth*, and *certainty of knowledge*. *Certainty of truth* is, when words are so put together in propositions, as exactly to express the agreement or disagreement of the *ideas* they stand for,

as really it is. *Certainty of knowledge* is, to perceive the agreement or disagreement of *ideas*, as expressed in any proposition. This we usually call knowing, or being certain of the truth of any proposition.

§ 4. *No Proposition can be known to be true, where the Essence of each Species mentioned is not known.*

Now because we cannot be certain of the truth of any general proposition, unless we know the precise bounds and extent of the species its terms stand for, it is necessary we should know the essence of each species, which is that which constitutes and bounds it. This, in all simple *ideas* and modes, is not hard to do. For in these, the real and nominal essence being the same, or, which is all one, the abstract *idea* which the general term stands for, being the sole essence and boundary that is or can be supposed of the species, there can be no doubt, how far the species extends, or what things are comprehended under each term: which, it is evident, are all that have an exact conformity with the *idea* it stands for, and no other. But in substances wherein a real essence distinct from the nominal, is supposed to constitute, determine, and bound the species, the extent of the general word is very uncertain: because not knowing this real essence, we cannot know what is, or is not of that species; and consequently what may, or may not with certainty be affirmed of it. And thus speaking of a *man*, or *gold*, or any other species of natural substances, as supposed constituted by a precise real essence, which nature regularly imparts to every individual of that kind, whereby it is made to be of that species, we cannot be certain of the truth of any affirmation or negation made of it. For *man*, or *gold*, taken in this sense, and used for species of things constituted by real essences different from the complex *idea* in the mind of the speaker, stand for we know not what: and the extent of these species, with such boundaries, are so unknown and undetermined, that it is impossible with any certainty to affirm, that all men are rational, or that all gold is yellow. But where the no-

minimal essence is kept to, as the boundary of each species, and men extend the application of any general term no farther than to the particular things in which the complex *idea* it stands for is to be found, there they are in no danger to mistake the bounds of each *species*, nor can be in doubt, on this account, whether any proposition be true or no. I have chose to explain this uncertainty of propositions in this scholastic way, and have made use of the terms of *essences* and *species*, on purpose to show the absurdity and inconvenience there is to think of them, as of any other sort of realities, than barely abstract *ideas* with names to them. To suppose that the *species* of things are any thing but the sorting of them under general names, according as they agree to several abstract *ideas*, of which we make those names the signs, is to confound truth, and introduce uncertainty into all general propositions that can be made about them. Though therefore these things might, to people not possessed with scholastic learning, be perhaps treated of in a better and clearer way; yet those wrong notions of *essences* or *species* having got root in most people's minds, who have received any tincture from the learning which has prevailed in this part of the world, are to be discovered and removed, to make way for that use of words which should convey certainty with it.

§ 5. *This more particularly concerns Substances.*

THE names of substances then, whenever made to stand for species, which are supposed to be constituted by real essences, which we know not, are not capable to convey certainty to the understanding: of the truth of general propositions made up of such terms, we cannot be sure. The reason whereof is plain: for how can we be sure that this or that quality is in *gold*, when we know not what is or is not *gold*? Since in this way of speaking, nothing is *gold* but what partakes of an essence, which we not knowing, cannot know where it is or is not, and so cannot be sure that any parcel of matter in the world is or is not in this sense *gold*; being incurably ignorant, whether it has or has not

that which makes any thing to be called *gold*, i. e. that real essence of *gold* whereof we have no *idea* at all: this being as impossible for us to know, as it is for a blind man to tell in what flower the colour of a *panſie* is, or is not to be found, whilst he has no *idea* of the colour of a *panſie* at all. Or if we could (which is impossible) certainly know where a real essence, which we know not, is; v. g. in what parcels of matter the real essence of *gold* is; yet could we not be sure, that this or that quality could with truth be affirmed of *gold*: since it is impossible for us to know, that this or that quality or *idea* has a necessary connection with a real essence, of which we have no *idea* at all, whatever species that supposed real essence may be imagined to constitute.

§ 6. *The Truth of few universal Propositions concerning Substances is to be known.*

ON the other side, the *names of substances*, when made use of, as they should be, for the *ideas* men have in their minds, though they carry a clear and determinate signification with them, will not yet serve us to make many universal propositions, of whose truth we can be certain. Not because in this use of them we are uncertain what things are signified by them, but because the complex *ideas* they stand for, are such combinations of simple ones, as carry not with them any discoverable connection or repugnancy, but with a very few other *ideas*.

§ 7. *Because Co-existence of Ideas in few cases is to be known.*

THE complex *ideas*, that our names of the species of substances properly stand for, are collections of such qualities as have been observed to co-exist in an unknown *substratum*, which we call *substance*: but what other qualities necessarily co-exist with such combinations, we cannot certainly know, unless we can discover their natural dependence; which in their primary qualities, we can go but a very little way in; and in all their secondary qualities, we can discover no connection at all, for the reasons mentioned, chap. 3.

viz. 1. Because we know not the real constitutions of substances, on which each *secondary quality* particularly depends. 2. Did we know that, it would serve us only for experimental (not universal) knowledge; and reach with certainty no farther than that bare instance: because our understandings can discover no conceivable connection between any *secondary quality*, and any modification whatsoever of any of the *primary* ones. And therefore there are very few general propositions to be made concerning substances, which can carry with them *undoubted certainty*.

§ 8. *Instance in Gold.*

ALL gold is fixed, is a proposition whose truth we cannot be certain of, how universally soever it be believed. For if, according to the useless imagination of the schools, any one supposes the term *gold* to stand for a species of things set out by nature, by a real essence belonging to it, it is evident he knows not what particular substances are of that species; and so cannot, with certainty, affirm any thing universally of *gold*. But if he makes *gold* stand for a species determined by its nominal essence, let the nominal essence, for example, be the complex *idea* of a *body* of a certain *yellow* colour, *malleable*, *fusible*, and *heavier* than any other known; in this proper use of the word *gold*, there is no difficulty to know what is or is not *gold*. But yet no other quality can with certainty be universally affirmed or denied of *gold*, but what hath a discoverable connection or inconsistency with that nominal essence. *Fixedness*, for example, having no necessary connection, that we can discover, with the colour, weight, or any other simple *idea* of our complex one, or with the whole combination together; it is impossible that we should certainly know the truth of this proposition, that *all gold is fixed*.

§ 9.

As there is no discoverable connection between *fixedness*, and the colour, weight, and other simple *ideas* of that nominal essence of *gold*; so if we make our complex *idea* of *gold*, a *body* *yellow*, *fusible*, *ductile*,

weighty, and *fixed*, we shall be at the same uncertainty concerning *solubility* in *aqua regia*, and for the same reason: since we can never, from consideration of the *ideas* themselves, with certainty affirm or deny of a body, whose complex *idea* is made up of yellow, very weighty, ductile, fusible, and fixed, that it is soluble in *aqua regia*; and so on, of the rest of its qualities. I would gladly meet with one general affirmation concerning any quality of *gold*, that any one can certainly know is true. It will, no doubt, be presently objected, is not this an universal certain proposition, *all gold is malleable*? To which I answer, it is a very certain proposition, if *malleableness* be a part of the complex *idea* the word *gold* stands for. But then here is nothing affirmed of *gold*, but that that sound stands for an *idea* in which *malleableness* is contained: and such a sort of truth and certainty as this, it is to say *a centaur is four-footed*. But if *malleableness* makes not a part of the specific essence the name *gold* stands for, it is plain, *all gold is malleable*, is not a certain proposition. Because, let the complex *idea* of *gold* be made up of which soever of its other qualities you please, *malleableness* will not appear to depend on that complex *idea*, nor follow from any simple one contained in it: the connection that *malleableness* has (if it has any) with those other qualities, being only by the intervention of the real constitution of its insensible parts; which, since we know not, it is impossible we should perceive that connection, unless we could discover that which ties them together.

§ 10. *As far as any such Co-existence can be known, so far universal Propositions may be certain. But this will go but a little way, because,*

THE more, indeed, of these co-existing qualities we unite into one complex *idea*, under one name, the more precise and determinate we make the signification of that word; but yet never make it thereby more capable of *universal certainty*, in respect of other qualities not contained in our complex *idea*; since we perceive not their connection or dependence one on

another, being ignorant both of that real constitution in which they are all founded, and also how they flow from it. For the chief part of our knowledge concerning substances, is not, as in other things, barely of the relation of two *ideas* that may exist separately; but is of the necessary connection and co-existence of several distinct *ideas* in the same subject, or of their repugnancy so to co-exist. Could we begin at the other end, and discover what it was, wherein that colour consisted, what made a body lighter or heavier, what texture of parts made it malleable, fusible, and fixed, and fit to be dissolved in this sort of liquor, and not in another; if (I say) we had such an *idea* as this of bodies, and could perceive wherein all sensible qualities originally consist, and how they are produced; we might frame such abstract *ideas* of them, as would furnish us with matter of more general knowledge, and enable us to make universal propositions, that should carry *general truth* and *certainty* with them. But whilst our complex *ideas* of the sorts of substances are so remote from that internal real constitution, on which their sensible qualities depend, and are made up of nothing but an imperfect collection of those apparent qualities our senses can discover; there can be very few general propositions concerning substances, of whose real truth we can be *certainly* assured: since there are but few simple *ideas*, of whose connection and necessary co-existence we can have certain and undoubted knowledge. I imagine, amongst all the *secondary qualities* of substances, and the powers relating to them, there cannot any two be named, whose necessary co-existence, or repugnance to co-exist, can certainly be known, unless in those of the same sense, which necessarily exclude one another, as I have elsewhere showed. No one, I think, by the colour that is in any body, can certainly know what smell, taste, sound, or tangible qualities it has, nor what alterations it is capable to make or receive, on or from other bodies. The same may be said of the sound or taste, &c. Our specific names of substances standing for

any collections of such *ideas*, it is not to be wondered, that we can with them make very few general propositions of *undoubted real certainty*. But yet so far as any complex *idea*, of any sort of substances, contains in it any simple *idea*, whose necessary co-existence with any other may be discovered, so far *universal propositions* may with *certainty* be made concerning it: v. g. could any one discover a necessary connection between *malleableness*, and the *colour* or *weight* of *gold*, or any other part of the complex *idea* signified by that name, he might make a *certain* universal proposition concerning *gold* in this respect; and the real truth of this proposition, that *all gold is malleable*, would be as *certain* as of this, *the three angles of all right lined triangles are equal to two right ones*.

§ 11. *The Qualities which make our complex Ideas of Substances, depend mostly on external, remote, and unperceived Causes.*

HAD we such *ideas* of substances, as to know what real constitutions produce those sensible qualities we find in them, and how those qualities flowed from thence, we could by the specific *ideas* of their real essences in our own minds, more certainly find out their properties, and discover what qualities they had or had not, than we can now by our senses: and to know the properties of *gold*, it would be no more necessary that *gold* should exist, and that we should make experiments upon it, than it is necessary for the knowing the properties of a triangle, that a triangle should exist in any matter; the *idea* in our minds would serve for the one as well as the other. But we are so far from being admitted into the secrets of Nature, that we scarce so much as ever approach the first entrance towards them. For we are wont to consider the substances we meet with, each of them as an entire thing by itself, having all its qualities in itself, and independent of other things; overlooking, for the most part, the operations of those invisible fluids they are encompassed with, and upon whose motions and operations depend the greatest part of those qualities

which are taken notice of in them, and are made by us the inherent marks of distinction whereby we know and denominate them. Put a piece of *gold* any where by itself, separate from the reach and influence of all other bodies, it will immediately lose all its colour and weight, and perhaps malleableness too; which, for ought I know, would be changed into perfect friability. *Water*, in which to us *fluidity* is an essential quality, left to itself, would cease to be fluid. But if inanimate bodies owe so much of their present state to other bodies without them, that they would not be what they appear to us, were those bodies that environ them removed, it is yet more so in *vegetables*, which are nourished, grow, and produce leaves, flowers, and seeds, in a constant succession. And if we look a little nearer into the state of *animals*, we shall find that their dependence, as to life, motion, and the most considerable qualities to be observed in them, is so wholly on extrinsical causes and qualities of other bodies, that make no part of them, that they cannot subsist a moment without them: though yet those bodies on which they depend, are little taken notice of, and make no part of the complex *ideas* we frame of those animals. Take the air but a minute from the greatest part of living creatures, and they presently lose sense, life, and motion. This the necessity of breathing has forced into our knowledge. But how many other extrinsical, and possibly very remote bodies, do the springs of those admirable machines depend on, which are not vulgarly observed, or so much as thought on; and how many are there, which the severest inquiry can never discover? The inhabitants of this spot of the universe, though removed so many millions of miles from the sun, yet depend so much on the duly tempered motion of particles coming from, or agitated by it, that were this earth removed but a small part of that distance out of its present situation, and placed a little farther or nearer that source of heat, it is more than probable that the greatest part of the animals in it would immediately perish: since

we find them so often destroyed by an excess or defect of the sun's warmth, which an accidental position, in some parts of this our little globe, exposes them to. The qualities observed in a *loadstone* must needs have their source far beyond the confines of that body; and the ravage made often on several sorts of animals, by invisible causes, the certain death (as we are told) of some of them, by barely passing the line, or, as it is certain of others, by being removed into a neighbouring country, evidently show that the concurrence and operation of several bodies, with which they are seldom thought to have any thing to do, is absolutely necessary to make them be what they appear to us, and to preserve those qualities by which we know and distinguish them. We are then quite out of the way, when we think that things contain within themselves the qualities that appear to us in them: And we in vain search for that constitution within the body of a fly, or an elephant, upon which depend those qualities and powers we observe in them. For which, perhaps, to understand them aright, we ought to look not only beyond this our earth and atmosphere, but even beyond the sun, or remotest star our eyes have yet discovered. For how much the being and operation of particular substances in this our globe depend on causes utterly beyond our view, is impossible for us to determine. We see and perceive some of the motions, and grosser operations of things here about us; but whence the streams come that keep all these curious machines in motion and repair, how conveyed and modified, is beyond our notice and apprehension: and the great parts and wheels, as I may so say, of this stupendous structure of the universe, may, for ought we know, have such a connection and dependence in their influences and operations one upon another, that perhaps things in this our mansion would put on quite another face, and cease to be what they are, if some one of the stars or great bodies incomprehensibly remote from us, should cease to be or move as it does. This is certain. Things however

absolute and entire they seem in themselves, are but retainers to other parts of nature, for that which they are most taken notice of by us. Their observable qualities, actions, and powers, are owing to something without them; and there is not so complete and perfect a part that we know of nature, which does not owe the being it has, and the excellencies of it, to its neighbours; and we must not confine our thoughts within the surface of any body, but look a great deal farther, to comprehend perfectly those qualities that are in it.

§ 12.

If this be so, it is not to be wondered, that *we have very imperfect ideas of substances*; and that the real essences, on which depend their properties and operations, are unknown to us. We cannot discover so much as that *size, figure, and texture* of their minute and active parts, which is really in them; much less the different motions and impulses made in and upon them by bodies from without, upon which depends, and by which is formed, the greatest and most remarkable part of those qualities we observe in them, and of which our complex *ideas* of them are made up. This consideration alone is enough to put an end to all our hopes of ever having the *ideas* of their real essences; which, whilst we want the nominal essences we make use of instead of them, will be able to furnish us but very sparingly with any *general knowledge*, or universal propositions capable of real *certainty*.

§ 13. *Judgment may reach farther, but that is not Knowledge.*

WE are not therefore to wonder, if *certainty* be to be found in very few general propositions made concerning substances: Our knowledge of their qualities and properties go very seldom farther than our senses reach and inform us. Possibly inquisitive and observing men may, by strength of *judgment* penetrate farther, and on probabilities taken from wary observation, and hints well laid together, often guess right at what experience has not yet discovered to them. But

this is but guessing still; it amounts only to opinion, and has not that *certainty* which is requisite to knowledge. For all *general knowledge* lies only in our own thoughts, and consists barely in the contemplation of our own abstract *ideas*. Wherever we perceive any agreement or disagreement amongst them, there we have *general knowledge*; and by putting the names of those *ideas* together accordingly in propositions, can with certainty pronounce *general truths*. But because the abstract *ideas* of substances, for which their specific names stand, whenever they have any distinct and determinate signification, have a discoverable connection or inconsistency with but a very few other *ideas*; the *certainty of universal propositions concerning substances* is very narrow and scanty in that part, which is our principal inquiry concerning them: and there is scarce any of the names of substances, let the *idea* it is applied to be what it will, of which we can generally and with certainty pronounce, that it has or has not this or that other quality belonging to it, and constantly co-existing or inconsistent with that *idea*, wherever it is to be found.

§ 14. *What is requisite for our Knowledge of Substances.*

BEFORE we can have any tolerable knowledge of this kind, we must first know what changes the *primary qualities* of one body do regularly produce in the *primary qualities* of another, and how. Secondly, We must know what *primary qualities* of any body produce certain sensations or *ideas* in us. This is in truth no less than to know all the effects of matter, under its divers modifications of bulk, figure, cohesion of parts, motion and rest. Which, I think, every body will allow, is utterly impossible to be known by us without revelation. Nor if it were revealed to us, what sort of figure, bulk and motion of corpuscles, would produce in us the sensation of a *yellow* colour, and what sort of figure, bulk and texture of parts, in the superficies of any body, were fit to give such corpuscles their due motion to produce that colour;

would that be enough to make *universal* propositions with *certainty*, concerning the several sorts of them, unless we had faculties acute enough to perceive the precise bulk, figure, texture and motion of bodies in those minute parts, by which they operate on our senses, that so we might by those frame our abstract ideas of them. I have mentioned here only *corporeal* substances, whose operations seem to lie more level to our understandings: For as to the *operations of spirits*, both their thinking and moving of bodies, we at first sight find ourselves at a loss; though perhaps when we have applied our thoughts a little nearer to the consideration of bodies, and their operations, and examined how far our notions, even in these, reach, with any clearness, beyond sensible matter of fact, we shall be bound to confess, that even in these too our discoveries amount to very little beyond perfect ignorance and incapacity.

§ 15. *Whilst our Ideas of Substances contain not their real Constitutions, we can make but few general certain Propositions concerning them.*

THIS is evident, *the abstract complex ideas of substances*, for which their general names stand, not comprehending their real constitutions, *can afford us but very little universal certainty*. Because our *ideas* of them are not made up of that, on which those qualities we observe in them, and would inform ourselves about, do depend, or with which they have any certain connection: *v. g.* Let the *idea* to which we give the name *man*, be, as it commonly is, a body of the ordinary shape, with sense, voluntary motion, and reason joined to it: This being the abstract *idea*, and consequently the essence of our species *man*, we can make but very few general certain propositions concerning *man*, standing for such an *idea*. Because not knowing the real constitution on which sensation, power of motion, and reasoning, with that peculiar shape, depend, and whereby they are united together in the same subject, there are very few other qualities, with which we can perceive them to have a necessary connection: and therefore we can-

not with certainty affirm, That *all men sleep by intervals*; that *no man can be nourished by wood or stones*; that *all men will be poisoned by hemlock*: because these *ideas* have no connection nor repugnancy with this our nominal essence of *man*, with this abstract *idea* that name stands for. We must in these and the like appeal to trial in particular subjects, which can reach but a little way. We must content ourselves with probability in the rest; but can have no general certainty, whilst our specific *idea* of *man* contains not that real constitution, which is the root, wherein all his inseparable qualities are united, and from whence they flow. Whilst our *idea*, the word *man* stands for, is only an imperfect collection of some sensible qualities and powers in him, there is no discernible connection or repugnance between our specific *idea*, and the operation of either the parts of hemlock or stones, upon his constitution. There are animals that safely eat hemlock, and others that are nourished by wood and stones: But as long as we want *ideas* of those real constitutions of different sorts of animals, whereon these and the like qualities and powers depend, we must not hope to reach *certainty* in universal propositions concerning them. Those few *ideas* only which have a discernible connection with our nominal essence, or any part of it, can afford us such propositions. But these are so few, and of so little moment, that we may justly look on our certain *general knowledge of substances*, as almost none at all.

§ 16. *Wherein lies the general Certainty of Propositions.*

To conclude, *general propositions*, of what kind soever, are then only capable of *certainty*, when the terms used in them stand for such *ideas*, whose agreement or disagreement, as there expressed, is capable to be discovered by us. And we are then certain of their truth or falsehood, when we perceive the *ideas* the terms stand for, to agree or not agree, according as they are affirmed or denied one of another. Whence we may take notice, that *general certainty* is never to

be found but in our *ideas*. Whenever we go to seek it elsewhere in experiment, or observations without us, our knowledge goes not beyond particulars. It is the contemplation of our own abstract *ideas*, that alone is able to afford us *general knowledge*.

CHAP. VII.

OF MAXIMS.

§ 1. *They are self-evident.*

THERE are a sort of propositions, which under the name of *maxims* and *axioms* have passed for principles of science; and because they are *self-evident*, have been supposed innate, although no body (that I know) ever went about to show the reason and foundation of their clearness or cogency. It may however be worth while to inquire into the reason of their evidence, and see whether it be peculiar to them alone, and also examine how far they influence and govern our other knowledge.

§ 2. *Wherein that Self-evidence consists.*

KNOWLEDGE, as has been shown, consists in the perception of the agreement or disagreement of *ideas*: Now where that agreement or disagreement is perceived immediately by itself, without the intervention or help of any other, there our *knowledge* is *self-evident*. This will appear to be so to any one, who will but consider any of those propositions, which, without any proof, he assents to at first sight: for in all of them he will find, that the reason of his assent is from that agreement or disagreement, which the mind, by an immediate comparing them, finds in those *ideas* answering the affirmation or negation in the proposition.

§ 3. *Self-evidence not peculiar to received Axioms.*

THIS being so, in the next place let us consider, whether this *self-evidence* be peculiar only to those propositions, which commonly pass under the name of

maxims, and have the dignity of axioms allowed them. And here it is plain, that several other truths, not allowed to be axioms, partake equally with them in this *self-evidence*. This we shall see, if we go over these several sorts of agreement or disagreement of *ideas*, which I have above-mentioned, *viz.* identity, relation, co-existence, and real existence; which will discover to us, that not only those few propositions, which have had the credit of *maxims*, are self-evident, but a great many, even almost an infinite number of *other propositions* are such.

§ 4. 1. *As to Identity and Diversity, all Propositions are equally self-evident.*

For, *first*, the immediate perception of the agreement or disagreement of *identity*, being founded in the mind's having distinct *ideas*, this affords us as many *self-evident* propositions, as we have distinct *ideas*. Every one that has any knowledge at all, has, as the foundation of it, various and distinct *ideas*. And it is the first act of the mind (without which it can never be capable of any knowledge) to know every one of its *ideas* by itself, and distinguish it from others. Every one finds in himself, that he knows the *ideas* he has; that he knows also, when any one is in his understanding, and what it is: and that when more than one are there, he knows them distinctly and unconfusedly one from another. Which always being so (it being impossible but that he should perceive what he perceives), he can never be in doubt when any *idea* is in his mind, that it is there, and is that *idea* it is, and that two distinct *ideas*, when they are in his mind, are there, and are not one and the same *idea*. So that all such affirmations and negations are made without any possibility of doubt, uncertainty or hesitation, and must necessarily be assented to as soon as understood; that is, as soon as we have in our minds determined *ideas*, which the terms in the proposition stand for. And therefore wherever the mind with attention considers any proposition, so as to perceive the two *ideas*, signified by the terms, and affirm-

ed or denied one of the other, to be the same or different; it is presently and infallibly certain of the truth of such a proposition, and this equally, whether these propositions be in terms standing for more general *ideas*, or such as are less so, v. g. whether the general *idea* of *being* be affirmed of itself, as in this proposition, *whatsoever is, is*; or a more particular *idea* be affirmed of itself, as *a man is a man*, or *whatsoever is white, is white*; or whether the *idea* of *being* in general be denied of *not being*, which is the only (if I may so call it) *idea* different from it, as in this other proposition, *it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be*; or any *idea* of any particular *being* be denied of another different from it, as *a man is not a horse*, *red is not blue*. The difference of the *ideas*, as soon as the terms are understood, makes the truth of the proposition presently visible, and that with an equal certainty and easiness in the less, as well as the more general propositions, and all for the same reason, viz. because the mind perceives in any *ideas*, that it has the same *idea* to the same with itself; and two different *ideas* to be different, and not the same. And this it is equally certain of, whether these *ideas* be more or less general, abstract and comprehensive. It is not therefore alone to these two general propositions, *whatsoever is, is*; and, *it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be*; that this self-evidence belongs by any peculiar right. The perception of *being*, or *not being*, belongs no more to these vague *ideas*, signified by the terms *whatsoever* and *thing*, than it does to any other *ideas*. These two general maxims amounting to no more, in short, but this, that *the same is the same*, and *same is not different*, are truths known in more particular instances, as well as in these general maxims, and known also in particular instances, before these general maxims are ever thought on, and draw all their force from the discernment of the mind employed about particular *ideas*. There is nothing more visible than that the mind, without the help of any proof, or reflection on either of these general pro-

positions, perceives so clearly, and knows so certainly, that the *idea* of white is the *idea* of white, and not the *idea* of blue; and that the *idea* of white, when it is in the mind, is there, and is not absent; that the consideration of these axioms can add nothing to the evidence or certainty of its knowledge. Just so it is (as every one may experiment in himself) in all the *ideas* a man has in his mind: He knows each to be itself, and not to be another; and to be in his mind, and not away when it is there, with a certainty that cannot be greater; and therefore the truth of no general proposition can be known with a greater certainty, nor add any thing to this. So that in respect of identity, our intuitive knowledge reaches as far as our *ideas*. And we are capable of making as many self-evident propositions, as we have names for distinct *ideas*. And I appeal to every one's own mind, whether this proposition, *a circle is a circle*, be not as self-evident a proposition, as that consisting of more general terms, *whatsoever is, is*: And again, whether this proposition, *blue is not red*, be not a proposition that the mind can no more doubt of, as soon as it understands the words, that it does of that axiom, *it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be*; and so of all the like.

§ 5. 2. *In Co-existence we have few self-evident Propositions.*

SECONDLY, As to *co-existence*, or such necessary connection between two *ideas*, that in the subject where one of them is supposed, there the other must necessarily be also: Of such agreement or disagreement as this, the mind has an immediate preception but in very few of them, and therefore in this sort we have but very little intuitive knowledge; nor are there to be found very many propositions that are self-evident, though some there are; *v. g.* the *idea* of filling a place equal to the contents of its superficies, being annexed to our *idea* of body, I think it is a self-evident proposition, *that two bodies cannot be in the same place*.

§ 6. 3. *In other Relations we may have.*

THIRDLY, As to the *relations* of modes, mathematicians have framed many axioms concerning that one relation of equality. As *equals taken from equals, the remainder will be equals*; which, with the rest of that kind, however, they are received for maxims by the mathematicians, and are unquestionable truths; yet, I think, that any one who considers them, will not find that they have a clearer self-evidence than these, that *one and one are equal to two*; that *if you take from the five fingers of one hand two, and from the five fingers of the other hand two, the remaining numbers will be equal*. These and a thousand other such propositions may be found in numbers, which at the very first hearing, force the assent, and carry with them an equal, if not greater clearness, than those mathematical axioms.

§ 7. 4. *Concerning real Existence we have none.*

FOURTHLY, As to *real existence*, since that has no connection with any other *ideas*, but that of ourselves, and of a first being, we have in that, concerning the real existence of all other beings, not so much as demonstrative, much less a self evident knowledge; and therefore concerning those there are no maxims.

§ 8. *Those Axioms do not much influence our other Knowledge.*

In the next place, let us consider, what *influence* these received *maxims* have upon the other parts of our knowledge. The rules established in the schools, that all reasonings are *ex præcognitis* & *præconcessis*, seem to lay the foundation of all other knowledge in these maxims, and to suppose them to be *præcognita*; whereby, I think, are meant these two things: First, That these axioms are those truths that are first known to the mind. And, Secondly, That upon them the other parts of our knowledge depend.

§ 9. *Because they are not the Truths we first knew.*

FIRST, That they are not the *truths first known* to the mind is evident to experience, as we have shown in another place, *Book I. Chap. 1.* Who perceives not that a

child certainly knows that a stranger is not its mother; that its sucking-bottle is not the rod, long before he knows that *it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be?* And how many truths are there about numbers, which it is obvious to observe that the mind is perfectly acquainted with, and fully convinced of, before it ever thought on these general maxims, to which mathematicians, in their arguings, do sometimes refer them? Whereof the reason is very plain: For that which makes the mind assent to such propositions, being nothing else but the perception it has of the agreement or disagreement of its *ideas*, according as it finds them affirmed or denied one of another in words it understands, and every *idea* being known to be what it is, and every two distinct *ideas* being known not to be the same; it must necessarily follow, that such self-evident truths must be *first* known, which consist of *ideas* that are *first* in the mind: and the *ideas first* in the mind, it is evident, are those of particular things, from whence, by slow degrees, the understanding proceeds to some few general ones; which being taken from the ordinary and familiar objects of sense, are settled in the mind, with general names to them. Thus particular *ideas* are *first* received and distinguished, and so knowledge got about them; and next to them, the less general or specific, which are next to particular: For abstract *ideas* are not so obvious or easy to children, or the yet unexercised mind, as particular ones. If they seem so to grown men, it is only because by constant and familiar use they are made so. For when we nicely reflect upon them, we shall find, that general *ideas* are fictions and contrivances of the mind, that carry difficulty with them, and do not so easily offer themselves, as we are apt to imagine. For example, does it not require some pains and skill to form the *general idea* of a *triangle* (which is yet none of the most abstract, comprehensive and difficult), for it must be neither oblique, nor rectangle, neither equilateral, equicrural, nor scale-non; but all and none of these at once? In effect, it

is something imperfect, that cannot exist; an *idea* wherein some parts of several different and inconsistent *ideas* are put together. It is true, the mind, in this imperfect state, has need of such *ideas*, and makes all the haste to them it can, for the conveniency of communication and enlargement of knowledge; to both which it is naturally very much inclined. But yet one has reason to suspect such *ideas* are marks of our imperfection; at least this is enough to show, that the most abstract and general *ideas* are not those that the mind is *first* and most easily acquainted with, nor such as its earliest knowledge is conversant about.

§ 10. *Because on them the other Parts of our Knowledge do not depend.*

SECONDLY, From what has been said, it plainly follows, that these magnified *maxims* are not the principles and *foundations* of all our other *knowledge*. For if there be a great many other truths, which have as much self-evidence as they, and a great many that we know before them, it is impossible they should be the *principles*, from which we deduce all other truths. Is it impossible to know that *one* and *two* are equal to *three*, but by virtue of this, or some such axiom, *viz. the whole is equal to all its parts taken together*? Many a one knows that *one* and *two* are equal to *three*, without having heard, or thought on that, or any other axiom, by which it might be proved; and knows it as certainly, as any other man knows, that the *whole is equal to all its parts*, or any other maxim, and all from the same reason of self-evidence; the equality of those *ideas* being as visible and certain to him without that, or any other axiom, as with it, it needing no proof to make it perceived. Nor after the knowledge, that *the whole is equal to all its parts*, does he know that *one* and *two* are equal to *three*, better or more certainly, than he did before. For if there be any odds in those *ideas*, the *whole* and *parts* are more obscure, or at least more difficult to be settled in the mind, than those of *one*, *two* and *three*. And indeed, I think, I may ask these men, who will needs have all know-

ledge besides those general principles themselves to depend on general, innate and self-evident principles, what principle is requisite to prove, that *one* and *one* are *two*, that *two* and *two* are *four*, that *three* times *two* are *six*? Which being known without any proof, do evince, that either all knowledge does not depend on certain *præcognita*, or general maxims, called principles, or else that these are principles; and if these are to be counted principles, a great part of numeration will be so. To which if we add all the self-evident propositions, which may be made about all our distinct *ideas*, principles will be almost infinite, at least innumerable, which men arrive to the knowledge of, at different ages; and a great many of these innate principles, they never come to know all their lives. But whether they come in view of the mind, earlier or later, this is true of them, that they are all known by their native evidence, are wholly independent, receive no light, nor are capable of any proof one from another; much less the more particular, from the more general; or the more simple, from the more compounded: the more simple, and less abstract, being the most familiar, and the easier and earlier apprehended. But which ever be the clearest *ideas*, the evidence and *certainty* of all such propositions is in this, that a man sees the same *idea* to be the same *idea*, and infallibly perceives two different *ideas* to be different *ideas*. For when a man has in his understanding the *ideas* of *one* and of *two*, the *idea* of *yellow* and the *idea* of *blue*, he cannot but certainly know, that the *idea* of *one* is the *idea* of *one*, and not the *idea* of *two*; and that the *idea* of *yellow* is the *idea* of *yellow*, and not the *idea* of *blue*. For a man cannot confound the *ideas* in his mind, which he has distinct: that would be to have them confused and distinct at the same time, which is a contradiction: and to have none distinct, is to have no use of our faculties, to have no knowledge at all. And therefore, what *idea* soever is affirmed of itself, or whatsoever two entire distinct *ideas* are denied one of another, the mind can-

not but assent to such a proposition as infallibly true, as soon as it understands the terms without hesitation or need of proof, or regarding those made in more general terms, and called maxims.

§ II. *What use these general Maxims have.*

WHAT shall we then say? Are these general maxims of no use? By no means; though perhaps their use is not that, which it is commonly taken to be. But since doubting in the least of what hath been by some men ascribed to these maxims, may be apt to be cried out against, as overturning the foundations of all the sciences; it may be worth while to consider them, with respect to other parts of our knowledge, and examine more particularly to what purposes they serve, and to what not.

1. It is evident from what has been already said, that they are of no use to prove or confirm less general self-evident propositions.

2. It is as plain that they are not, nor have been the foundations whereon any science hath been built. There is, I know, a great deal of talk, propagated from scholastic men, of sciences and the maxims on which they are built: But it has been my ill luck never to meet with any such sciences; much less any one built upon these two maxims; *what is is*; and *it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be*. And I would be glad to be shown where any such science, erected upon these, or any other general axioms, is to be found: and should be obliged to any one, who would lay before me the frame and system of any science so built on these or any such like maxims, that could not be shown to stand as firm without any consideration of them. I ask, whether these general maxims have not the same use in the study of divinity, and in theological questions, that they have in the other sciences? They serve here too to silence wranglers, and put an end to dispute. But I think that nobody will therefore say, that the *Christian* religion is built upon these maxims, or that the knowledge we have of it is derived from these principles. It is from

revelation we have received it, and without revelation these *maxims* had never been able to help us to it. When we find out an *idea*, by whose intervention we discover the connection of two others, this is a revelation from God to us, by the voice of reason. For we then come to know a truth that we did not know before. When God declares any truth to us, this is a revelation to us by the voice of his spirit, and we are advanced in our knowledge. But in neither of these do we receive our light or knowledge from *maxims*. But in the one, the things themselves afford it, and we see the truth in them by perceiving their agreement or disagreement. In the other, God himself affords it immediately to us, and we see the truth of what he says in his unerring veracity.

3. They are not of use to help men forward in the advancement of sciences, or new discoveries of yet unknown truths. Mr. Newton, in his never enough to be admired book, has demonstrated several propositions, which are so many new truths, before unknown to the world, and are farther advances in mathematical knowledge: But for the discovery of these, it was not the general *maxims*, *what is is*; or, *the whole is bigger than a part*, or the like, that helped him. These were not the clues that led him into the discovery of the truth and certainty of those propositions. Nor was it by them that he got the knowledge of those demonstrations; but by finding out intermediate *ideas*, that showed the agreement or disagreement of the *ideas*, as expressed in the propositions he demonstrated. This is the great exercise and improvement of human understanding in the enlarging of knowledge, and advancing the sciences; wherein they are far enough from receiving any help from the contemplation of these, or the like magnified *maxims*. Would those who have this traditional admiration of these propositions, that they think no step can be made in knowledge without the support of an *axiom*, no stone laid in the building of the sciences without a general *maxim*, but distinguish between the me-

thod of acquiring knowledge, and of communicating ; between the method of raising any science, and that of teaching it to others as far as it is advanced ; they would see that those general *maxims* were not the foundations on which the first discoverers raised their admirable structures, nor the keys that unlocked and opened those secrets of knowledge. Though afterwards, when schools were erected, and sciences had their professors to teach what others had found out, they often made use of *maxims*, *i. e.* laid down certain propositions which were self-evident, or to be received for true ; which being settled in the minds of their scholars, as unquestionable verities, they on occasion made use of, to convince them of truths in particular instances that were not so familiar to their minds, as those general *axioms* which had before been inculcated to them, and carefully settled in their minds. Though these particular instances, when well reflected on, are no less self-evident to the understanding, than the general *maxims* brought to confirm them : And it was in those particular instances that the first discoverer found the truth, without the help of the general *maxims* : And so may any one else do, who with attention considers them.

To come, therefore, to the use that is made of *maxims*.

1. They are of use, as has been observed, in the ordinary methods of teaching sciences as far as they are advanced ; but of little or none in advancing them farther.

2. They are of use in disputes, for the silencing of obstinate wranglers, and bringing those contests to some conclusion. Whether a need of them to that end came not in, in the manner following, I crave leave to inquire. The schools having made disputation the touchstone of mens abilities, and the *criterion* of knowledge, adjudged victory to him that kept the field ; and he that had the last word, was concluded to have the better of the argument, if not of the cause. But because by this means there was like to be no decision be-

tween skilful combatants, whilst one never failed of a *medius terminus* to prove any proposition; and the other could as constantly, without, or with a distinction, deny the *major* or *minor*; to prevent, as much as could be, the running out of disputes into an endless train of syllogisms, certain general propositions, most of them indeed self-evident, were introduced into the schools; which being such as all men allowed and agreed in, were looked on as general measures of truth, and served instead of principles (where the disputants had not laid down any other between them), beyond which there was no going, and which must not be receded from by either side. And thus these *maxims* getting the name of *principles*, beyond which men in dispute could not retreat, were by mistake taken to be the originals and sources, from whence all knowledge began, and the foundations whereon the sciences were built. Because, when in their disputes they came to any of these, they stopped there, and went no farther, the matter was determined. But how much this is a mistake hath been already shown.

This method of the schools, which have been thought the fountains of knowledge, introduced, as I suppose, the like use of these maxims, into a great part of conversation out of the schools, to stop the mouths of cavillers, whom any one is excused from arguing any longer with, when they deny these general self-evident principles received by all reasonable men, who have once thought of them: but yet their use herein is but to put an end to wrangling. They, in truth, when urged in such cases, teach nothing: that is already done by the intermediate *ideas* made use of in the debate, whose connection may be seen without the help of those maxims, and so the truth known before the maxim is produced, and the argument brought to a first principle. Men would give off a wrong argument before it came to that, if in their disputes they proposed to themselves the finding and embracing of truth, and not a contest for victory.

And thus maxims have their use to put a stop to their perverseness, whose ingenuity should have yielded sooner. But the method of the schools having allowed and encouraged men to oppose and resist evident truth till they are baffled, *i. e.* till they are reduced to contradict themselves or some established principle; it is no wonder that they should not in civil conversation be ashamed of that, which in the schools is counted a virtue and a glory; *viz.* obstinately to maintain that side of the question they have chosen, whether true or false to the last extremity; even after conviction. A strange way to attain truth and knowledge: and that which I think the rational part of mankind, not corrupted by education, could scarce believe should ever be admitted amongst the lovers of truth, and students of religion or nature; or introduced into the seminaries of those who are to propagate the truths of religion or philosophy amongst the ignorant and unconvinced. How much such a way of learning is likely to turn young mens minds from the sincere search and love of truth; nay, and to make them doubt whether there is any such thing, or at least worth the adhering to, I shall not now inquire. This I think, that bating those places, which brought the *peripatetic* philosophy into their schools, where it continued many ages, without teaching the world any thing but the art of wrangling; these maxims were no where thought the foundations on which the sciences were built, nor the great helps to the advancement of knowledge.

What Use these general Maxims have.

As to these *general maxims*, therefore, they are, as I have said, of great *use* in disputes, to *stop the mouths of wranglers*; but not of much *use* to the discovery of unknown truths, or to help the mind forwards in its search after knowledge. For whoever began to build his knowledge on this general proposition, *what is is*; or, *it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be*: and from either of these as from a principle of science, deduced a *system* of useful knowledge:

Wrong opinions often involving contradictions, one of these maxims, as a touchstone, may serve well to show whither they lead. But yet, however fit to lay open the absurdity or mistake of a man's reasoning or opinion, they are of very little use for enlightening the understanding: and it will not be found, that the mind receives much help from them in its progress in knowledge; which would be neither less, nor less certain, were these two general propositions never thought on. It is true, as I have said, they sometimes serve in augmentation to stop a wrangler's mouth, by showing the absurdity of what he saith, and by exposing him to the shame of contradicting what all the world knows, and he himself cannot but own to be true. But it is one thing to show a man that he is in an error, and another to put him in possession of truth: and I would fain know what truths these two propositions are able to teach, and by their influence make us know, which we did not know before, or could not know without them. Let us reason from them as well as we can, they are only about identical predications, and influence, if any at all, none but such. Each particular proposition concerning identity or diversity, is as clearly and certainly known in itself, if attended to, as either of these general ones: only these general ones, as serving in all cases, are therefore more inculcated and insisted on. As to other less general maxims, many of them are no more than bare verbal propositions, and teach us nothing but the respect and import of names one to another. *The whole is equal to all its parts*; what real truth, I beseech you, does it teach us? What more is contained in that maxim than what the signification of the word *totum*, or the *whole*, does of itself import? And he that knows that the word *whole* stands for what is made up of all its parts, knows very little less, than that the *whole* is equal to all its *parts*. And upon the same ground, I think that this proposition, *a hill is higher than a valley*, and several the like, may also pass for maxims. But yet masters of *mathematics*, when they would, as teachers of what

they know, initiate others in that science, do not without reason place this, and some other such maxims, at the entrance of their *systems*; that their scholars, having in the beginning perfectly acquainted their thoughts with these propositions made in such general terms, may be used to make such reflections, and have these more general propositions, as formed rules and sayings, ready to apply to all particular cases. Not that if they be equally weighed, they are more clear and evident than the particular instances they are brought to confirm; but that being more familiar to the mind, the very naming them is enough to satisfy the understanding. But this, I say, is more from our custom of using them, and the establishment they have got in our minds by our often thinking of them, than from the different evidence of the things. But before custom has settled methods of thinking and reasoning in our minds, I am apt to imagine it is quite otherwise; and that the child, when a part of his apple is taken away, knows it better in that particular instance, than by this general proposition, *the whole is equal to all its parts*; and that if one of these have need to be confirmed to him by the other, the general has more need to be let into his mind by the particular, than the particular by the general. For in particulars our knowledge begins, and so spreads itself by degrees to generals. Though afterwards the mind takes the quite contrary course, and having drawn his knowledge into as general propositions as it can, makes those familiar to its thoughts, and accustoms itself to have recourse to them, as to the standards of truth and falsehood. By which familiar *use of them*, as rules to measure the truth of other propositions, it comes in time to be thought, that more particular propositions have their truth and evidence from their conformity to these more general ones, which in discourse and argumentation, are so frequently urged, and constantly admitted. And this I think to be the reason why amongst so many self-evident propositions, the most general only have had the title of maxims.

§ 12. *Maxims, if Care be not taken in the Use of words, may prove Contradictions.*

ONE thing farther, I think, it may not be amiss to observe concerning these general maxims, that they are so far from improving or establishing our minds in true knowledge, that if our notions be wrong, loose, or unsteady, and we resign up our thoughts to the sound of words, rather than fix them on settled determined *ideas* of things: I say these *general maxims* will serve to confirm us in mistakes; and in such a way of use of words, which is most common, will serve to prove contradictions: e. g. he that, with *Des Cartes*, shall frame in his mind an *idea* of what he calls *body*, to be nothing but extension, may easily demonstrate, that there is no *vacuum*, i. e. no space void of body, by this *maxim*, *what is is*. For the *idea* to which he annexes the name *body*, being bare extension, his knowledge, that space cannot be without body, is certain. For he knows his own *idea* of extension clearly and distinctly, and knows that it is *what it is*, and not another *idea*, though it be called by these three names, *extension*, *body*, *space*. Which three words, standing for one and the same *idea*, may no doubt, with the same evidence and certainty, be affirmed one of another, as each of itself: and it is as certain, that whilst I use them all to stand for one and the same *idea*, this predication is as true and identical in its signification, *that space is body*, as this predication is true and identical, *that body is body*, both in signification and sound.

§ 13. *Instance in Vacuum.*

BUT if another shall come, and make to himself another *idea* different from *Des Cartes's*, of the thing, which yet, with *Des Cartes*, he calls by the same name *body*; and make his *idea*, which he expresses by the word *body* to be of a thing that hath both *extension* and *solidity* together; he will as easily demonstrate, that there may be a *vacuum*, or space without a body, as *Des Cartes* demonstrated the contrary. Because the *idea*, to which he gives the name *space*, be-

ing barely the simple one of *extension*; and the *idea*, to which he gives the name *body*, being the complex *idea* of *extension* and *resistibility*, or *solidity*, together in the same subject, these two *ideas* are not exactly one and the same, but in the understanding as distinct as the *ideas* of one and two, white and black, or as of *corporeity* and *humanity*, if I may use those barbarous terms: and therefore the predication of them in our minds, or in words standing for them, is not identical, but the negation of them one of another: *viz.* this proposition, *extension or space is not body*, is as true and evidently certain, as this maxim, *it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be*, can make any proposition.

§ 14. *They prove not the Existence of Things without us.*

BUT yet, though both these propositions (as you see) may be equally demonstrated, *viz.* that there may be a *vacuum*, and that there cannot be a *vacuum*; by these two certain principles, (*viz.*) *what is, is*; and *the same thing cannot be, and be*: yet neither of these principles will serve to prove to us, that any, or what bodies do exist: for that we are left to our senses, to discover to us as far as they can. Those universal and self-evident principles, being only our constant, clear, and distinct knowledge of our own *ideas*, more general or comprehensive, can assure us of nothing that passes without the mind, their certainty is founded only upon the knowledge we have of each *idea* by itself, and of its distinction from others; about which we cannot be mistaken whilst they are in our minds, though we may, and often are mistaken, when we retain the names without the *ideas*; or use them confusedly sometimes for one, and sometimes for another *idea*. In which cases the force of these *axioms*, reaching only to the sound, and not the signification of the words, serves only to lead us into confusion, mistake, and error. It is to show men, that these maxims, however cried up for the great guards of truth, will not secure them from error in a careless loose use of

their words, that I have made this remark. In all that is here suggested concerning the little use for the improvement of knowledge, or dangerous use in undetermined *ideas*, I have been far enough from saying or intending they should be *laid aside*, as some have been too forward to charge me. I affirm them to be truths, self-evident truths; and so cannot be *laid aside*. As far as their influence will reach, it is in vain to endeavour, nor would I attempt to abridge it. But yet without any injury to truth or knowledge, I may have reason to think their use is not answerable to the great stress which seems to be laid on them; and I may warn men not to make an ill use of them, for the confirming themselves in errors.

§ 15. *Their Application dangerous about complex Ideas.*

BUT let them be of what use they will in verbal propositions, they cannot discover or prove to us the least knowledge of the nature of substances, as they are found and exist without us, any farther than grounded on experience. And though the consequence of these two propositions, called principles, be very clear, and their *use* not dangerous or hurtful, in the probation of such things, wherein there is no need at all of them for proof, but such as are clear by themselves without them, *viz.* where our *ideas* are determined, and known by the names that stand for them: yet when these principles, *viz.* *what is is*; and *it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be*; are made use of in the probation of propositions, wherein are words standing for complex *ideas*, *v. g.* *man, horse, gold, virtue*; there they are of infinite danger, and most commonly make men receive and retain falsehood for manifest truth, and uncertainty for demonstration: upon which follows error, obstinacy, and all the mischiefs that can happen for wrong reasoning. The reason whereof is not, that these principles are less true, or of less force in proving propositions made of terms standing for complex *ideas*, than where the propositions are about simple *ideas*: but because men mistake

generally, thinking that where the same terms are preserved, the propositions are about the same things, though the *ideas* they stand for are in truth different; therefore these maxims are made use of to support those, which in sound and appearance are contradictory propositions; as is clear in the demonstrations above mentioned about a *vacuum*. So that whilst men take words for things, as usually they do, these maxims may and do commonly serve to prove contradictory propositions: as shall yet be farther made manifest.

§ 16. *Instance in Man.*

FOR instance; let *man* be that concerning which you would by these first principles demonstrate any thing, and we shall see, that so far as demonstration is by these principles, it is only verbal, and gives us no certain universal true proposition, or knowledge of any being existing without us. First, a child having framed the *idea* of a *man*, it is probable that his *idea* is just like that picture, which the painter makes of the visible appearances joined together; and such a complication of *ideas*, together in his understanding, makes up the single complex *idea* which he calls *man*, whereof white or flesh-colour in *England* being one, the child can demonstrate to you that a *Negro* is not a *man*, because white colour was one of the constant simple *ideas* of the complex *idea* he calls *man*: and therefore he can demonstrate by the principle, *it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be* that a *negro* is not a *man*; the foundation of his certainty being not that universal proposition, which perhaps he never heard nor thought of, but the clear distinct perception he hath of his own simple *ideas* of black and white, which he cannot be persuaded to take, nor can ever mistake one for another, whether he knows that maxim or no: and to this child, or any one who hath such an *idea*, which he calls *man*, can you never demonstrate that a *man* hath a soul, because his *idea* of *man* includes no such notion or *idea* in it. And therefore to him the principle of *what is is*, proves not this

matter; but it depends upon collection and observation, by which he is to make his complex *idea* called *man*.

§ 17.

SECONDLY, another that hath gone farther in framing and collecting the *idea* he calls *man*, and to the outward shape adds *laughter* and *rational discourse*, may demonstrate that infants and changelings are no men, by this maxim, *it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be*: and I have discoursed with very rational men, who have actually denied that they are *men*.

§ 18.

THIRDLY, perhaps another makes up the complex *idea* which he calls *man*, only out of the *ideas* of body in general, and the powers of language and reason, and leaves out the shape wholly: this man is able to demonstrate, that a man may have no hands, but be *quadrupes*, neither of those being included in his *idea* of *man*; and in whatever body or shape he found *speech* and *reason* joined, that was a *man*: because having a clear knowledge of such a complex *idea*, it is certain that *what is is*.

§ 19. *Little Use of these Maxims in Proofs where we have clear and distinct Ideas.*

So that, if rightly considered, I think we may say, that where our *ideas* are determined in our minds, and have annexed to them by us known and steady names under those settled determinations, there is *little need* or *no use* at all of these *maxims*, to prove the agreement or disagreement of any of them. He that cannot discern the truth or falsehood of such propositions, without the help of these and the like maxims, will not be *helped* by these maxims to do it: since he cannot be supposed to know the truth of these maxims themselves without proof, if he cannot know the truth of others without proof, which are as self-evident as these. Upon this ground it is that intuitive knowledge neither requires nor admits any proof, one part of it more than another. He that will suppose it does, takes away the foundation of all knowledge and cer-

tainty : and he that needs any proof to make him certain, and give his assent to this proposition, that *two are equal to two*, will also have need of a proof to make him admit, that *what is is*. He that needs a probation to convince him, that *two are not three*, that *white is not black*, that *a triangle is not a circle*, &c. or any other two determined distinct *ideas* are not one and the same, will need also a demonstration to convince him, that it is impossible *for the same thing to be, and not to be*.

§ 20. *Their Use dangerous where our Ideas are confused.*

AND as these maxims are of *little use*, where we have determined *ideas*, so they are, as I have showed, of *dangerous use*, where our *ideas* are not determined; and where we use words that are not annexed to determined *ideas*, but such as are of a loose and wandering signification, sometimes standing for one, and sometimes for another *idea* : from which follows mistake and error, which these maxims (brought as proofs to establish propositions, wherein the terms stand for undetermined *ideas*) do by their authority confirm and rivet.

CHAP. VIII.

OF TRIFLING PROPOSITIONS.

§ 1. *Some propositions bring no Increase to our Knowledge.*

WHETHER the maxims treated of in the foregoing chapter, be of that use to real knowledge, as is generally supposed, I leave to be considered. This, I think, may confidently be affirmed, that there are universal propositions; which, though they be certainly true, yet they add no light to our understandings; bring no increase to our knowledge. Such are,

§ 2. *As first, Identical Propositions.*

FIRST, All purely identical propositions. These obviously and at first blush, appear to contain no instruc-

tion in them. For when we affirm the said term of itself, whether it be barely verbal, or whether it contains any clear and real *idea*, it shows us nothing but what we must certainly know before, whether such a proposition be either made by or proposed to us. Indeed that most general one, *what is is*, may serve sometimes to show a man the absurdity he is guilty of, when by circumlocution, or equivocal terms, he would in particular instances, deny the same thing of itself; because nobody will so openly bid defiance to common sense, as to affirm visible and direct contradictions in plain words; or if he does, a man is excused if he breaks off any farther discourse with him. But, yet I think I may say, that neither that received maxim, nor any other identical proposition teaches us any thing: and though in such kind of propositions, this great and magnified maxim, boasted to be the foundation of demonstration, may be, and often is made use of to confirm them; yet all it proves amounts to no more than this, that the same word may with great certainty be affirmed of itself, without any doubt of the truth of any such proposition, and let me add also, without any real knowledge.

§ 3.

FOR at this rate, any very ignorant person, who can but make a proposition, and knows what he means when he says, *ay* or *no*, may make a million of propositions, of whose truths he may be infallibly certain, and yet not know one thing in the world thereby; *v. g.* what is a soul is a soul; or *a soul is a soul*; *a spirit is a spirit*; *a feitiche is a feitiche*, &c. These all being equivalent to this proposition, *viz. what is is*, *i. e. what hath existence hath existence*; or, *who hath a soul, hath a soul*. What is this more than trifling with words? It is but like a monkey shifting his oyster from one hand to the other; and had he had but words, might, no doubt, have said, oyster in right hand is *subject*, and oyster in left hand is *predicate*: and so might have made a self-evident proposition of oyster, *i. e. oyster is oyster*; and yet, with all this,

not have been one whit the wiser or more knowing: and that way of handling the matter would much at one have satisfied the monkey's hunger, or a man's understanding; and they two would have improved in knowledge and bulk together.

I know there are some, who because *identical propositions* are self-evident, show a great concern for them, and think they do great service to philosophy by crying them up, as if in them was contained all knowledge, and the understanding were led into all truth by them only. I grant, as forwardly as any one, that they are all true and self-evident. I grant, farther, that the foundation of all our knowledge lies in the faculty we have of perceiving the same *idea* to be the same, and of discerning it from those that are different, as I have shown in the foregoing chapter. But how that vindicates the making use of *identical propositions*, for the improvement of knowledge, from the imputation of trifling, I do not see. Let any one repeat, as often as he pleases, that the *will is the will*, or lay what stress on it he thinks fit; of what use is this, and an infinite the like propositions, for the enlarging our knowledge? Let a man abound as much as the plenty of words, which he has, will permit him in such propositions as these; *a law is a law*, and *obligation is obligation*; *right is right*, and *wrong is wrong*: will these and the like ever help him to an acquaintance with *ethics*? or instruct him or others in the knowledge of *morality*? Those who know not, nor perhaps ever will know, what is *right* and what is *wrong*, nor the measures of them, can with as much assurance make, and infallibly know the truth of these and all such propositions, as he that is best instructed in *morality* can do. But what advance do such propositions give in the knowledge of any thing necessary or useful for their conduct?

He would be thought to do little less than trifle, who, for the enlightening the understanding in any part of knowledge, should be busy with *identical propositions*, and insist on such maxims as these: *sub-*

stance is substance, and body is body; a vacuum is a vacuum, and a vortex is a vortex; a centaur is a centaur, and a chimera is a chimera, &c. For these and all such are equally true, equally certain, and equally self-evident. But yet they cannot but be counted trifling, when made use of as principles of instruction, and stress laid on them, as helps to knowledge: since they teach nothing but what every one, who is capable of discourse, knows without being told, *viz.* That the same term is the same term, and the same idea the same idea. And upon this account it was that I formerly did, and do still think, the offering and inculcating such propositions, in order to give the understanding any new light or inlet into the knowledge of things, no better than trifling.

Instruction lies in something very different; and he that would enlarge his own, or another's mind, to truths he does not yet know, must find out intermediate *ideas*, and then lay them in such order one by another, that the understanding may see the agreement or disagreement of those in question. Propositions that do this, are instructive; but they are far from such as affirm the same term of itself: which is no way to advance one's self or others, in any sort of knowledge. It no more helps to that, than it would help any one in his learning to read, to have such propositions as these inculcated to him, *an A is an A*, and *a B is a B*; which a man may know as well as any schoolmaster, and yet never be able to read a word as long as he lives. Nor do these, or any such identical propositions help him one jot forward in the skill of reading, let him make what use of them he can.

If those who blame my calling them *trifling propositions*, had but read, and been at the pains to understand what I had above writ in very plain *English*, they could not but have seen that by *identical propositions*, I mean only such wherein the same term importing the same *idea*, is affirmed of itself: which I take to be the proper signification of *identical propositions*; and concerning all such, I think I may continue safely

to say, that to propose them as instructive, is no better than trifling. For no one who has the use of reason can miss them, where it is necessary they should be taken notice of; nor doubt of their truth, when he does take notice of them.

But if men will call propositions *identical*, wherein the same term is not affirmed of itself, whether they speak more properly than I, others must judge: this is certain, all that they say of propositions that are not *identical* in my sense, concerns not me, nor what I have said; all that I have said relating to those propositions wherein the same term is affirmed of itself. And I would fain see an instance, wherein any such can be made use of, to the advantage and improvement of any one's knowledge. Instances of other kinds, whatever use may be made of them, concern not me, as not being such as I call *identical*.

§ 4. *Secondly, When a Part of any complex Idea is predicated of the whole.*

SECONDLY, Another sort of trifling propositions is, when a part of the complex Idea is predicated of the name of the whole; a part of the definition of the word defined. Such are all propositions wherein the *genus* is predicated of the *species*, or more comprehensive or less comprehensive terms: for what information, what knowledge carries this proposition in it, *viz. lead is a metal*, to a man who knows the complex idea the name *lead* stands for? all the simple ideas that go to the complex one signified by the term *metal*, being nothing but what he before comprehended, and signified by the name *lead*. Indeed to a man that knows the signification of the word *metal*, and not of the word *lead*, it is a shorter way to explain the signification of the word *lead*, by saying it is a *metal*, which at once expresses several of its simple ideas, than to enumerate them one by one, telling him it is a body very *heavy, fusible and malleable*.

§ 5. *As Part of the Definition of the Terms defined.* ALIKE trifling it is, to predicate any other part of the definition of the term defined, or to affirm any one of

the simple *ideas* of a complex one, of the name of the whole complex *idea*; as *all gold is fusible*. For *fusibility* being one of the simple *ideas* that goes to the making up the complex one the sound *gold* stands for, what can it be but playing with sounds, to affirm that of the name *gold*, which is comprehended in its received signification? It would be thought little better than ridiculous, to affirm gravely as a truth of moment, that *gold is yellow*; and I see not how it is any jot more material to say, *it is fusible*, unless that quality be left out of the complex *idea*, of which the sound *gold* is the mark in ordinary speech. What instruction can it carry with it, to tell one that which he hath been told already, or he is supposed to know before? For I am supposed to know the signification of the word another uses to me, or else he is to tell me. And if I know that the name *gold* stands for this complex *idea* of *body, yellow, heavy, fusible, malleable*, it will not much instruct me to put it solemnly afterwards in a proposition, and gravely say, *all gold is fusible*. Such propositions can only serve to show the disingenuity of one, who will go from the definition of his own terms, by reminding him sometimes of it; but carry no knowledge with them, but of the signification of words, however certain they be.

§ 6. Instance—*Man and Palfry*.

EVERY man is an animal, or living body, is as certain a proposition as can be; but no more conducing to the knowledge of things than to say, *a palfry is an ambling horse*, or a neighing ambling animal, both being only about the signification of words, and make me know but this: that *body, sense, and motion*, or power of sensation and moving, are three of those *ideas* that I always comprehend and signify by the word *man*; and where they are not to be found together, the name *man* belongs not to that thing: and so of the other, that *body, sense, and a certain way of going, with a certain kind of voice*, are some of those *ideas* which I always comprehend, and signify by the word *palfry*; and when they are not to be found to-

gether, the name *palsry* belongs not to that thing. It is just the same, and to the same purpose, when any term standing for any one or more of the simple *ideas*, that altogether make up that complex *idea* which is called a *man*, is affirmed of the term *man*: v. g. suppose a *Roman* signified by the word *homo*, all these distinct *ideas*, united in one subject, *corporeitas*, *sensibilitas*, *potentia*, *se movendi*, *rationalitas*, *risibilitas*; he might, no doubt, with great certainty, universally affirm one, more, or all of these together of the word *homo*, but did no more than say that the word *homo*, in his country, comprehended in its signification all these *ideas*. Much like a romance knight, who by the word *palsry* signified these *ideas*; *body of a certain figure, four-legged, with sense, motion, ambling, neighing, white, used to have a woman on his back*; might with the same certainty universally affirm also any or all of these of the word *palsry*: but did thereby teach no more, but that the word *palsry*, in his or romance language, stood for all these, and was not to be applied to any thing, where any of these was wanting. But he that shall tell me, that in whatever thing *sense, motion, reason, laughter*, were united, that thing had actually a notion of GOD, or would be cast into a sleep by *opium*, made indeed an instructive proposition: because neither *having the notion of GOD*, nor *being cast into sleep by opium*, being contained in the *ideas* signified by the word *man*, we are by such propositions taught something more than barely what the word *man* stands for; and therefore the knowledge contained in it, is more than *verbal*.

§ 7. *For this teaches but the Signification of Words.* BEFORE a man makes any proposition, he is supposed to understand the terms he uses in it, or else he talks like a parrot, only making a noise by imitation, and framing certain sounds, which he has learnt of others; but not as a rational creature, using them for signs of *ideas* which he has in his mind. The hearer also is supposed to understand the terms as the speaker uses them, or else he talks jargon, and makes an unintel-

ligible noise. And therefore he trifles with words, who makes such a proposition, which when it is made, contains no more than one of the terms does, and which a man was supposed to know before; *v. g. a triangle hath three sides, or saffron is yellow.* And this is no farther intolerable, than where a man goes to explain his terms, to one who is supposed or declares himself not to understand him; and then *it teaches only the signification of that word, and the use of that sign.*

§ 8. *But no real Knowledge.*

WE can know then the truth of two sorts of propositions with perfect *certainly*; the one is, of those trifling propositions which have a certainty in them, but it is only a *verbal certainty*, but not instructive. And, secondly, we can know the truth, and so may be *certain* in propositions which affirm something of another, which is a necessary consequence of its precise complex *idea*, but not contained in it: as that the *external angle of all triangles is bigger than either of the opposite internal angles*; which relation of the outward angle to either of the opposite internal angles, making no part of the complex *idea* signified by the name triangle, this is a real truth, and conveys with it instructive *real knowledge*.

§ 9. *General Propositions concerning Substances are often trifling.*

WE have little or no knowledge of what combinations there be of simple *ideas* existing together in substances, but by our senses, we cannot make any universal *certain* propositions concerning them, any farther than our nominal essences lead us: which being to a very few and inconsiderable truths, in respect of those which depend on their real constitutions, the general *propositions* that are made *about substances*, if they are *certain*, are for the most part but trifling; and if they are instructive are uncertain, and such as we can have no knowledge of their real truth, how much soever constant observation and analogy may assist our judgments in guessing. Hence it comes to pass, that

one may often meet with very clear and coherent discourses, that amount yet to nothing. For it is plain, that names of substantial beings, as well as others, as far as they have relative significations affixed to them, may, with great truth, be joined negatively and affirmatively in propositions as their relative definitions make them fit to be so joined; and propositions consisting of such terms, may, with the same clearness, be deduced one from another, as those that convey the most real truths: and all this, without any knowledge of the nature or reality of things existing without us. By this method one may make demonstrations and undoubted propositions in words, and yet thereby advance not one jot in the knowledge of the truth of things; v. g. he that having learnt these following words, with their ordinary mutual relative acceptations annexed to them; v. g. *substance, man, animal, form, soul, vegetative, sensitive, rational*, may make several undoubted propositions about the soul, without knowing at all what the soul really is: and of this sort, a man may find an infinite number of propositions, reasonings, and conclusions, in books of metaphysics, school-divinity, and some sort of natural philosophy, and after all, know as little of GOD, *spirits*, or *bodies*, as he did before he set out.

§ 10. *And why.*

HE that hath liberty to define, *i. e.* determine the signification of his names of substances (as certainly every one does in effect, who makes them stand for his own *ideas*), and makes their significations at a venture, taking them from his own or other mens fancies, and not from an examination or inquiry into the nature of things themselves; may, with little trouble, demonstrate them one of another, according to those several respects and mutual relations he has given them one to another; wherein, however, things agree or disagree in their own nature, he needs mind nothing but his own notions, with the names he hath bestowed upon them: but thereby no more increases his own knowledge, than he does his riches, who taking a bag

of counters, calls one in a certain place a *pound*, another in another place a *shilling*, and a third in a third place a *penny*; and so proceeding, may undoubtedly reckon right, and cast up a great sum, according to his counters so placed, and standing for more or less as he pleases, without being one jot the richer, or without even knowing how much a pound, shilling, or penny is, but only that one is contained in the other twenty times, and contains the other twelve: which a man may also do in the signification of words, by making them in respect of one another, more, or less, or equally comprehensive.

§ 11. *Thirdly, Using Words variously is trifling with them.*

THOUGH yet concerning most words used in discourses, especially argumentative and controversial, there is this more to be complained of, which is the worst sort of *trifling*, and which sets us yet farther from the certainty of knowledge we hope to attain by them, or find in them, viz. that most writers are so far from instructing us in the nature and knowledge of things, that they *use their words loosely* and uncertainly; and do not, by using them constantly and steadily in the same significations, make plain and clear deductions of words one from another, and make their discourses coherent and clear (how little soever it were instructive), which were not difficult to do, did they not find it convenient to shelter their ignorance or obstinacy, under the obscurity and perplexedness of their terms: to which, perhaps, inadvertency and ill custom do in many men much contribute.

§ 12. *Marks of verbal Propositions.*
To conclude; barely verbal propositions may be known by these following marks:

I. *Predication in abstract.*
FIRST, All propositions, wherein two abstract terms are affirmed one of another, are barely about the signification of sounds. For since no abstract idea can be the same with any other but itself, when its abstract name is affirmed of any other term, it can signify no

more but this, that it may or ought to be called by that name, or that these two names signify the same idea. Thus, should any one say that *parsimony is frugality*, that *gratitude is justice*, that this or that action is or is not *temperance*; however specious these and the like propositions may at first sight seem, yet when we come to press them, and examine nicely what they contain, we shall find that it all amounts to nothing but the signification of those terms.

§ 13. 2. *A part of the Definition predicated of any Term.*

SECONDLY, All propositions wherein a part of the complex Idea, which any term stands for, is predicated of that term, are only verbal; v. g. to say that *gold is a metal or heavy*. And thus all propositions, wherein more comprehensive words, called *genera*, are affirmed of subordinate or less comprehensive, called *species*, or *individuals*, are barely verbal.

When by these two rules we have examined the propositions that make up the discourses we ordinarily meet with both in and out of books, we shall, perhaps, find that a greater part of them, than is usually suspected, are purely about the signification of words, and contain nothing in them, but the use and application of these signs.

This, I think, I may lay down for an infallible rule, that wherever the distinct *idea* any word stands for, is not known and considered, and something not contained in the *idea* is not affirmed or denied of it; there our thoughts stick wholly in sounds, and are able to attain no real truth or falsehood. This, perhaps, if well heeded, might save us a great deal of useless amusement and dispute, and very much shorten our trouble and wandering, in the search of real and true knowledge.

CHAP. IX.

OF OUR KNOWLEDGE OF EXISTENCE.

§ 1. *General certain Propositions concern not Existence.*

HITHERTO we have only considered the essences of things, which being only abstract *ideas*, and thereby removed in our thoughts from particular existence (that being the proper operations of the mind, in abstraction, to consider an *idea* under no other existence, but what it has in the understanding), gives us no knowledge of real existence at all. Where, by the way, we may take notice, that *universal propositions*, of whose truth or falsehood we can have certain knowledge, concern not *existence*; and farther, that all *particular affirmations or negations*, that would not be certain if they were made general, are only concerning *existence*; they declaring only the accidental union or separation of *ideas* in things existing, which, in their abstract natures, have no known necessary union or repugnancy.

§ 2. *A threefold Knowledge of Existence.*

BUT leaving the nature of propositions, and different ways of predication to be considered more at large in another place, let us proceed now to inquire concerning our knowledge of the *existence* of things, and how we come by it. I say then, that we have the knowledge of *our own existence* by intuition; of the *existence of God* by demonstration; and of other things by sensation.

§ 3. *Our Knowledge of our own Existence is intuitive.*

As for *our own existence*, we perceive it so plainly, and so certainly, that it neither needs, nor is capable of any proof. For nothing can be more evident to us, than our own existence; *I think, I reason, I feel pleasure and pain*; can any of these be more evident to

me, than my own existence? If I doubt of all other things, that very doubt makes me perceive my own *existence*, and will not suffer me to doubt of that. For if I know *I feel pain*, it is evident I have as certain perception of my own existence, as of the existence of the pain I feel: Or if I know *I doubt*, I have as certain perception of the existence of the thing doubting, as of that thought which I call *doubt*. Experience then convinces us, that *we have an intuitive knowledge of our own existence*, and an internal infallible perception that we are. In every act of sensation, reasoning or thinking, we are conscious to ourselves of our own being; and, in this matter, come not short of the highest degree of *certainly*.

CHAP. X.

OF OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXISTENCE OF A GOD.

§ 1. *We are capable of knowing certainly that there is a God.*

THOUGH God has given us no innate *ideas* of himself, though he has stamped no original characters on our minds, wherein we may read his being; yet having furnished us with those faculties our minds are endowed with, he hath not left himself without witnesses: since we have sense, perception and reason, and cannot want a clear proof of him, as long as we carry ourselves about us. Nor can we justly complain of our ignorance in this great point, since he has so plentifully provided us with the means to discover; and know him, so far as is necessary to the end of our being, and the great concernment of our happiness. But though this be the most obvious truth that reason discovers; and though its evidence be (if I mistake not) equal to mathematical certainty, yet it requires thought and attention, and the mind must apply itself to a regular deduction of it from some part of our intuitive knowledge, or else we shall

be as uncertain and ignorant of this as of other propositions, which are in themselves capable of clear demonstration. To shew, therefore, that we are capable of *knowing*, i. e. *being certain that there is a God*, and how we may come by this certainty, I think we need go no farther than ourselves, and that undoubted knowledge we have of our own existence.

§ 2. *Man knows that he himself is.*

I THINK it is beyond question, that *man has a clear perception of his own being*; he knows certainly, that he exists, and that he is something. He that can doubt, whether he be any thing or no, I speak not to, no more than I would argue with pure nothing, or endeavour to convince non-entity, that it were something. If any one pretends to be so sceptical, as to deny his own existence (for really to doubt of it is manifestly impossible), let him for me enjoy his beloved happiness of being nothing, until hunger, or some other pain convince him of the contrary. This then, I think, I may take for a truth, which every one's certain knowledge assures him of, beyond the liberty of doubting, viz. That he is something that actually exists.

§ 3. *He knows also that Nothing cannot produce a Being, therefore something eternal.*

IN the next place, man knows by an intuitive certainty, that *bare nothing can no more produce any real being, than it can be equal to two right angles*. If a man knows not that non-entity, or the absence of all being cannot be equal to two right angles, it is impossible he should know any demonstration in Euclid. If, therefore, we know there is some real being, and that non-entity cannot produce any real being, it is an evident demonstration, that from eternity there has been something; since what was not from eternity, had a beginning, and what had a beginning, must be produced by something else.

§ 4. *That eternal Being must be most powerful.*

NEXT, it is evident, that what had its being and beginning from another, must also have all that which is

in, and belongs to its being from another too. All the powers it has must be owing to, and received from the same source. This eternal source, then, of all being, must also be the source and original of all power; and so *this eternal Being must be also the most powerful.*

§ 5. *And most knowing.*

AGAIN, a man finds in himself *perception* and *knowledge*. We have then got one step farther; and we are certain now, that there is not only some being, but some knowing intelligent being in the world.

There was a time, then, when there was no knowing being, and when knowledge began to be; or else there has been also *a knowing being from eternity*. If it be said, there was a time when no being had any knowledge, when that eternal Being was void of all understanding: I reply, that then it was impossible there should ever have been any knowledge: It being as impossible that things wholly void of knowledge, and operating blindly, and without any perception, should produce a knowing being, as it is impossible that a triangle should make itself three angles bigger than two right ones. For it is as repugnant to the *idea* of senseless matter, that it should put into itself sense, perception and knowledge, as it is repugnant to the *idea* of a triangle, that it should put into itself greater angles than two right ones.

§ 6. *And therefore GOD.*

THUS, from the consideration of ourselves, and what we infallibly find in our own constitutions, our reason leads us to the knowledge of this certain and evident truth, that *there is an eternal, most powerful, and most knowing being*; which whether any one will please to call *God*, it matters not. The thing is evident, and from this *idea* duly considered, will easily be deduced all those other attributes, which we ought to ascribe to this eternal Being. If, nevertheless, any one should be found so senselessly arrogant, as to suppose man alone knowing and wise, but yet the product of mere ignorance and chance; and that all the rest of the uni-

verse acted only by that blind hap-hazard: I shall leave with him that very rational and emphatical rebuke of Tully, l. 2. de leg. to be considered at his leisure, "What can be more fillily arrogant and misbecoming, than for a man to think that he has a mind and understanding in him, but yet in all the universe believes there is no such thing? Or that those things, which with the utmost stretch of his reason he can scarce comprehend, should be moved and managed without any reason at all?" *Quid est enim verius, quam neminem esse oportere tam stulte arrogantem, ut in se mentem & rationem putet inesse, in cælo mundoque non putet? Aut ea quæ vix summa ingenii ratione comprehendat, nulla ratione moveri putet?*

From what has been said, it is plain to me, we have a more certain knowledge of the existence of a God, than of any thing our senses have not immediately discovered to us. Nay, I presume I may say, that we more certainly know that there is a God, than that there is any thing else without us. When I say we know, I mean there is such a knowledge within our reach, which we cannot miss, if we will but apply our minds to that, as we do to several other inquiries.

§ 7. *Our Idea of a most perfect Being not the sole Proof of a God.*

How far the idea of a most perfect being, which a man may frame in his mind, does or does not prove the existence of a God, I will not here examine. For, in the different make of mens tempers and application of their thoughts, some arguments prevail more on one, and some on another, for the confirmation of the same truth. But yet, I think, this I may say, that it is an ill way of establishing this truth, and silencing atheists, to lay the whole stress of so important a point as this, upon that sole foundation; and take some mens having that idea of God in their minds (for it is evident some men have none, and some worse than none, and the most very different) for the only proof of a Deity; and out of an over-fondness of that darling invention, cashier, or at least endeavour to invalidate all other

arguments, and forbid us to hearken to those proofs, as being weak or fallacious, which our own existence, and the sensible parts of the universe offer so clearly and cogently to our thoughts, that I deem it impossible for a considering man to withstand them. For I judge it is as certain and clear a truth, as can any where be delivered, that *the invisible things of God are clearly seen from the creation of the world, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead.* Though our own being furnishes us, as I have shown, with an evident and incontestible proof of a Deity; and I believe no body can avoid the cogency of it, who will but as carefully attend to it, as to any other demonstration of so many parts: yet this being so fundamental a truth, and of that consequence, that all religion and genuine morality depend thereon, I doubt not but I shall be forgiven by my reader if I go over some parts of this argument again, and enlarge a little more upon them.

§ 8. *Something from Eternity.*

THERE is no truth more evident, than that *something* must be *from eternity*. I never yet heard of any one so unreasonable, or that could suppose so manifest a contradiction, as a time wherein there was perfectly nothing. This being of all absurdities the greatest, to imagine that pure nothing, the perfect negation and absence of all beings, should ever produce any real existence.

It being then unavoidable for all rational creatures to conclude, that something has existed from eternity; let us next see what kind of thing that must be.

§ 9. *Two sorts of Beings, cogitative and incogitative.*

THERE are but two sorts of beings in the world, that man knows or conceives.

First, Such as are purely material, without sense, preception or thought, as the clippings of our beards, and parings of our nails.

Secondly, Sensible, thinking, perceiving beings, such as we find ourselves to be, which, if you please, we

will hereafter call *cogitative* and *incogitative* beings; which to our present purpose, if for nothing else, are perhaps, better terms than material and immaterial.

§ 10. *Incogitative Being cannot produce a Cogitative*

IF, then, there must be something eternal, let us see what sort of being it must be. And to that, it is very obvious to reason, that it must necessarily be a *cogitative* being. For it is as impossible to conceive, that ever bare incogitative matter should produce a thinking intelligent being, as that nothing should of itself produce matter. Let us suppose any parcel of matter eternal, great or small, we shall find it, in itself, able to produce nothing. For example; let us suppose the matter of the next pebble we meet with, eternal, closely united, and the parts firmly at rest together, if there were no other being in the world, must it not eternally remain so, a dead inactive lump? Is it possible to conceive it can add motion to itself, being purely matter, or produce any thing? Matter, then, by its own strength, cannot produce in itself so much as motion: the motion it has must also be from eternity, or else be produced, and added to matter by some other being more powerful than matter; matter, as is evident, having not power to produce motion in itself. But let us suppose motion eternal too; yet matter, *incogitative matter* and motion, whatever changes it might produce of figure and bulk, *could never produce thought*: Knowledge will still be as far beyond the power of motion and matter to produce, as matter is beyond the power of *nothing*, or *non-entity* to produce. And I appeal to every one's own thoughts, whether he cannot as easily conceive matter produced by *nothing*, as thought to be produced by pure matter, when before there was no such thing as thought or an intelligent being existing. Divide matter into as minute parts as you will (which we are apt to imagine a sort of spiritualizing, or making a thinking thing of it), vary the figure and motion of it as much as you please, a globe, cube, cone, prism, cylinder, &c.

whose diameters are but 1000000th part of a gry *, will operate no otherwise upon other bodies of proportionable bulk, than those of an inch or foot diameter; and you may as rationally expect to produce sense, thought and knowledge, by putting together, in a certain figure and motion, gross particles of matter, as by those that are the very minutest that do any where exist. They knock, impel and resist one another, just as the greater do, and that is all they can do. So that if we will suppose nothing first, or eternal; *matter* can never begin to be: If we suppose bare matter, without motion, eternal; *motion* can never begin to be: If we suppose only matter and motion first, or eternal; *thought* can never begin to be. For it is impossible to conceive that matter, either with or without motion could have originally in and from itself sense, perception and knowledge, as is evident from hence, that then sense, perception and knowledge must be a property eternally inseparable from matter and every particle of it. Not to add, that though our general or specific conception of matter makes us speak of it as one thing, yet really all matter is not one individual thing, neither is there any such thing existing as one material being, or one single body that we know or can conceive. And therefore if matter were the eternal first cogitative being, there would not be one eternal infinite cogitative being, but an infinite number of eternal finite cogitative beings, independent one of another, of limited force, and distinct thoughts, which could never produce that order, harmony, and beauty which is to be found in nature. Since, therefore, whatsoever is the first eternal *being* must necessarily be cogitative; and whatsoever is first of all things, must necessarily contain in it, and actu-

* A gry is 1-10th of a line, a line 1-10th of an inch, an inch 1-10th of a philosophical foot, a philosophical foot 1-3d of a pendulum, whose diadroms, in the latitude of 45 degrees, are each equal to one second of time, or 1-60th of a minute. I have affectedly made use of this measure here, and the parts of it, under a decimal division, with names to them; because, I think, it would be of general convenience, that this should be the common measure in the commonwealth of letters.

ally have, at least, all the perfections that can ever after exist; nor can it ever give to another any perfection that it hath not, either actually in itself, or at least in a higher degree; it necessarily follows, that the first eternal Being cannot be matter.

§ 11. *Therefore there has been an eternal Wisdom.* IF, therefore, it be evident, that *something* necessarily must exist from eternity, it is also as evident, that *that something* must necessarily be a cogitative being: For it is as impossible that incogitative matter should produce a cogitative being, as that nothing, or the negation of all being, should produce a positive being or matter.

§ 12.

THOUGH this discovery of the *necessary existence of an eternal mind*, does sufficiently lead us into the knowledge of God, since it will hence follow, that all other knowing beings that have a beginning must depend on him, and have no other ways of knowledge, or extent of power, than what he gives them; and therefore if he made those, he made also the less-excellent pieces of this universe, all inanimate beings, whereby his *omniscience, power and providence* will be established, and all his other attributes necessarily follow: Yet to clear up this a little farther, we will see what doubts can be raised against it.

§ 13. *Whether material or no.*

FIRST, Perhaps it will be said, that though it be as clear as demonstration can make it, that there must be an eternal being, and that being must also be knowing; yet it does not follow, but that thinking being may also be material. Let it be so; it equally still follows, that there is a God. For if there be an eternal, omniscient, omnipotent being, it is certain that there is a God, whether you imagine that being to be material or no. But herein, I suppose, lies the danger and deceit of that supposition: There being no way to avoid the demonstration, that there is an eternal knowing being, men, devoted to matter, would willingly have it granted, that this knowing being is ma-

terial; and then letting slide out of their minds, of the discourse, the demonstration whereby an eternal knowing being was proved necessarily to exist, would argue all to be matter, and so deny a God, that is, an eternal cogitative being: whereby they are so far from establishing, that they destroy their own hypothesis. For, if there can be, in their opinion, eternal matter, without any eternal cogitative being, they manifestly separate matter and thinking, and suppose no necessary connection of the one with the other, and so establish the necessity of an eternal spirit, but not of matter; since it has been proved already, that an eternal cogitative being is unavoidably to be granted. Now, if thinking matter may be separated, *the eternal existence of matter will not follow from the eternal existence of a cogitative being*, and they suppose it to no purpose.

§ 14. *Not material, 1. Because every Particle of Matter is not cogitative.*

BUT now let us see how they can satisfy themselves or others, that this *eternal thinking being is material*.

First, I would ask them, whether they imagine, that all matter, *every particle of matter, thinks*? This, I suppose, they will scarce say; since, then, there would be as many eternal thinking beings as there are particles of matter, and so an infinity of gods. And yet if they will not allow matter as matter, that is, every particle of matter to be as well cogitative as extended, they will have as hard a task to make out to their own reasons, a cogitative being out of incogitative particles, as an extended being out of unextended parts, if I may so speak.

§ 15. *2. One Particle alone of Matter cannot be cogitative.*

SECONDLY, If all matter does not think, I next ask, whether it be *only one atom that does so*? This has as many absurdities as the other; for then this atom of matter must be alone eternal or not. If this alone be eternal, then this alone, by its powerful thought or will, made all the rest of matter. And so we have

the creation of matter by a powerful thought, which is that the materialists stick at. For if they suppose one single thinking atom to have produced all the rest of matter, they cannot ascribe that pre-eminency to it upon any other account, than that of its thinking, the only supposed difference. But allow it to be by some other way, which is above our conception, it must be still creation, and these men must give up their great maxim, *ex nihilo nil fit*. If it be said, that all the rest of matter is equally eternal, as that thinking atom, it will be to say any thing at pleasure, though never so absurd: For to suppose all matter eternal, and yet one small particle in knowledge and power infinitely above all the rest, is without any of the least appearance of reason to frame any hypothesis. Every particle of matter, as matter, is capable of all the same figures and motions of any other; and I challenge any one in his thoughts, to add any thing else to one above another.

§ 16. 3. *A System of incogitative Matter cannot be cogitative.*

THIRDLY, If, then, neither one peculiar atom alone can be this eternal thinking being; nor all matter, as matter, *i. e.* every particle of matter, can be it, it only remains, that it is *some certain system of matter* duly put together, that is this *thinking eternal being*. This is that which I imagine, is that notion which men are aptest to have of God; who would have him a material being, as most readily suggested to them, by the ordinary conceit they have of themselves, and other men, which they take to be material thinking beings. But this imagination, however more natural, is no less absurd than the other: For to suppose the eternal thinking being to be nothing else but a composition of particles of matter, each whereof is incogitative, is to ascribe all the wisdom and knowledge of that eternal being only to the *ju-ta*-position of parts; than which nothing can be more absurd. For unthinking particles of matter, however put together, can have nothing thereby added to them, but a new rela-

tion of position, which it is impossible should give thought and knowledge to them.

§ 17. *Whether in motion or at rest.*

BUT farther, this *corporeal system* either has all its parts at rest, or it is a certain motion of the parts wherein its thinking consists. If it be perfectly at rest, it is but one lump, and so can have no privileges above one atom.

If it be the motion of its parts, on which its thinking depends, all the thoughts there must be unavoidably accidental and limited; since all the particles that by motion cause thought, being each of them in itself without any thought, cannot regulate its own motions, much less be regulated by the thought of the whole; since that thought is not the cause of motion (for then it must be antecedent to it, and so without it), but the consequence of it, whereby freedom, power, choice, and all rational and wise thinking or acting, will be quite taken away: So that such a thinking being will be no better nor wiser than pure blind matter; since to resolve all into the accidental unguided motions of blind matter, or into thought depending on unguided motions of blind matter, is the same thing; not to mention the narrowness of such thoughts and knowledge that must depend on the motion of such parts. But there needs no enumeration of any more absurdities and impossibilities in this hypothesis (however full of them it be) than that before-mentioned; since let this thinking system be all, or a part of the matter of the universe, it is impossible that any one particle should either know its own, or the motion of any other particle, or the whole know the motion of every particular; and so regulate its own thoughts or motions, or indeed have any thought resulting from such motion.

§ 18. *Matter not co-eternal with an eternal Mind.*

OTHERS would have matter to be *eternal*, notwithstanding that they allow an eternal, cogitative, immaterial being. This, though it take not away the being of a God, yet since it denies one and the first great piece

of his workmanship, the creation, let us consider it a little. *Matter* must be allowed eternal; Why? Because you cannot conceive how it can be made out of nothing; why do you not also think yourself eternal? You will answer perhaps, because about twenty or forty years since you began to be. But if I ask you what that *you* is, which began then to be, you can scarce tell me. The matter, whereof you are made, began not then to be; for if it did, then it is not eternal: But it began to be put together in such a fashion and frame as makes up your body; but yet that frame of particles is not you, it makes not that thinking thing you are (for I have now to do with one who allows an eternal, immaterial, thinking being, but would have unthinking matter eternal too); therefore when did that thinking thing begin to be? If it did never begin to be, then have you always been a thinking thing from eternity; the absurdity whereof I need not confute, till I meet with one who is so void of understanding as to own it. If, therefore, you can allow a thinking thing to be made out of nothing (as all things that are not eternal must be), why also can you not allow it possible, for a material being to be made out of nothing, by an equal power, but that you have the experience of the one in view, and not of the other? Though, when well considered, creation of a spirit will be found to require no less power than the creation of matter. Nay, possibly, if we would emancipate ourselves from vulgar notions and raise our thoughts as far as they would reach, to a closer contemplation of things, we might be able to aim at some dim and seeming conception how matter might at first be made, and begin to exist, by the power of that eternal first Being; but to give beginning and being to a spirit, would be found a more inconceivable effect of omnipotent power. But this being what would perhaps lead us too far from the notions on which the philosophy now in the world is built, it would not be pardonable to deviate so far from them; or to inquire so far as grammar itself

would authorise, if the common settled opinion opposes it: especially in this place, where the received doctrine serves well enough to our present purpose, and leaves this past doubt, that the creation or beginning of any one substance out of nothing, being once admitted, the creation of all other, but the Creator himself, may, with the same ease, be supposed.

§ 19. *Matter not co-eternal with an eternal Mind.*

BUT you will say, is it not impossible to admit of the *making any thing out of nothing*, since we cannot possibly conceive it: I answer, No: 1. Because it is not reasonable to deny the power of an infinite Being, because we cannot comprehend its operations. We do not deny other effects upon this ground, because we cannot possibly conceive the manner of their production. We cannot conceive how any thing but impulse of body can move body; and yet that is not a reason sufficient to make us deny it possible, against the constant experience we have of it in ourselves, in all our voluntary motions, which are produced in us only by the free action or thought of our own minds; and are not, nor can be the effects of the impulse or determination of the motion of blind matter in or upon our bodies; for then it could not be in our power or choice to alter it. For example: my right hand writes, whilst my left hand is still: What causes rest in one, and motion in the other? Nothing but my will, a thought of my mind; my thought only changing, the right hand rests, and the left hand moves. This is matter of fact, which cannot be denied: explain this and make it intelligible, and then the next step will be to understand creation. For the giving a new determination to the motion of the animal spirits (which some make use of to explain voluntary motion) clears not the difficulty one jot: to alter the determination of motion, being in this case no easier nor less, than to give motion itself; since the new determination given to the animal spirits, must be either immediately by thought, or by some other body put in their way by thought; which was not in their way

before, and so must owe its motion to thought ; either of which leaves voluntary motion as unintelligible as it was before. In the mean time, it is an over-valuing ourselves, to reduce all to the narrow measure of our capacities ; and to conclude all things impossible to be done, whose manner of doing exceeds our comprehension. This is to make our comprehension infinite, or God finite, when what he can do is limited to what we can conceive of it. If you do not understand the operations of your own finite mind, that thinking thing within you, do not deem it strange, that you cannot comprehend the operations of that eternal infinite mind, who made and governs all things, and whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain.

C H A P. XI.

OF OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER THINGS.

§ 1. *It is to be had only by Sensation.*

THE knowledge of our own being, we have by intuition. The existence of a God, reason clearly makes known to us, as has been shown.

The *knowledge of the existence* of any other thing, we can have only by *sensation* : for there being no necessary connection of *real existence* with any *idea* a man hath in his memory, nor of any other existence but that of God, with the existence of any particular man ; no particular man can know the *existence* of any other being, but only when by actual operating upon him, it makes itself perceived by him. For the having the *idea* of any thing in our mind, no more proves the existence of that thing, than the picture of a man evidences his being in the world, or the visions of a dream make thereby a true history.

§ 2. *Instance—Whiteness of this Paper.*

It is therefore the actual receiving of *ideas* from without, that gives us notice of the *existence* of other

things, and makes us know that something doth exist at that time without us, which causes that *idea* in us, though perhaps we neither know nor consider how it does it: for it takes not from the certainty of our senses, and the *ideas* we receive by them, that we know not the manner wherein they are produced: *v. g.* whilst I write this, I have, by the paper affecting my eyes, that *idea* produced in my mind, which, whatever object causes, I call *white*; by which I know that that quality or accident (*i. e.* whose appearance before my eyes always causes that *idea*) doth really exist, and hath a being without me. And of this, the greatest assurance I can possibly have, and to which my faculties can attain, is the testimony of my eyes, which are the proper and sole judges of this thing, whose testimony I have reason to rely on as so certain, that I can no more doubt, whilst I write this, that I see white and black, and that something really exists, that causes that sensation in me, than that I write or move my hand: which is a certainty as great as human nature is capable of, concerning the existence of any thing, but a man's self alone, and of God.

§ 3. *This though not so certain as Demonstration, yet may be called Knowledge, and proves the existence of things without us.*

THE notice we have by our senses, of the existing of things without us, though it be not altogether so certain as our intuitive knowledge, or the deductions of our reason, employed about the clear abstract ideas of our own minds; yet it is an assurance that deserves the name of knowledge. If we persuade ourselves that our faculties act and inform us right, concerning the existence of those objects that affect them, it cannot pass for an ill-grounded confidence: for I think nobody can, in earnest, be so sceptical, as to be uncertain of the existence of those things which he sees and feels. At least, he that can doubt so far (whatever he may have with his own thoughts), will never have any controversy with me; since he can never be sure I say any thing contrary to his opinion. As to myself,

I think God has given me assurance enough of the existence of things without me ; since by their different application I can produce in myself both pleasure and pain, which is one great concernment of my present state. This is certain, the confidence that our faculties do not herein deceive us, is the greatest assurance we are capable of, concerning the existence of material beings. For we cannot act any thing, but by our faculties ; nor talk of knowledge itself, but by the help of those faculties, which are fitted to apprehend even what knowledge is. But besides the assurance we have from our senses themselves, that they do not err in the information they give us of the existence of things without us, when they are affected by them, we are farther confirmed in this assurance by other concurrent reasons.

§ 4. 1. *Because we cannot have them but by the Inlet of the Senses.*

FIRST, It is plain those perceptions are produced in us by exterior causes affecting our senses ; because *those that want the organs of any sense, never can have the ideas belonging to that sense* produced in their minds. This is too evident to be doubted : and therefore we cannot but be assured, that they come in by the organs of that sense, and no other way. The organs themselves, it is plain, do not produce them ; for then the eyes of a man in the dark, would produce colours, and his nose smell roses in the winter : but we see nobody gets the relish of a pine-apple, till he goes to the *Indies*, where it is, and tastes it.

§ 5. 2. *Because an Idea from actual Sensation, and another from Memory, are very distinct Perceptions.*

SECONDLY, *Because sometimes I find that I cannot avoid the having those Ideas produced in my mind.* For though, when my eyes are shut, or windows fast, I can at pleasure recal to my mind the *ideas* of light, or the *sun*, which former sensations had lodged in my memory ; so I can at pleasure lay by that *idea*, and take into my view that of the *smell* of a rose, or *taste*

of sugar. But if I turn my eyes at noon towards the sun, I cannot avoid the *ideas*, which the light, or sun, then produces in me. So that there is a manifest difference between the *ideas* laid up in my memory (over which, if they were there only, I should have constantly the same power to dispose of them, and lay them by at pleasure), and those which force themselves upon me, and I cannot avoid having. And therefore it must needs be some exterior cause, and the brisk acting of some objects without me, whose efficacy I cannot resist, that produces those *ideas* in my mind, whether I will or no. Besides, there is nobody who doth not perceive the difference in himself between contemplating the sun, as he hath the *idea* of it in his memory, and actually looking upon it: of which two, his perception is so distinct, that few of his *ideas* are more distinguishable one from another. And therefore he hath certain knowledge, that they are not both memory, or the actions of his mind, and fancies only within him; but that actual seeing hath a cause without.

§ 6. 3. *Pleasure or Pain which accompanies actual Sensation, accompanies not the returning of those Ideas without the external Objects.*

THIRDLY, Add to this, that *many of those ideas are produced in us with pain, which afterwards we remember without the least offence.* Thus the pain of heat or cold, when the *idea* of it is revived in our minds, gives us no disturbance; which, when felt was very troublesome, and is again, when actually repeated: which is occasioned by the disorder the external object causes in our bodies when applied to it. And we remember the pain of *hunger, thirst, or the head-ach*, without any pain at all; which would either never disturb us, or else constantly do it, as often as we thought of it, were there nothing more but *ideas* floating in our minds, and appearances entertaining our fancies, without the real existence of things affecting us from abroad. The same may be said of pleasure, accompanying several actual sensations: and though

mathematical demonstration depends not upon sense, yet the examining them by diagrams gives great credit to the evidence of our sight, and seems to give it a certainty approaching to that of demonstration itself. For it would be very strange, that a man should allow it for an undeniable truth, that two angles of a figure, which he measures by lines and angles of a diagram, should be bigger one than the other; and yet doubt of the existence of those lines and angles, which, by looking on, he makes use of to measure that by.

§ 7. 4. *Our Senses assist one another's Testimony of the Existence of outward Things.*

FOURTHLY, Our senses in many cases bear witness to the truth of each other's report, concerning the existence of sensible things without us. He that sees a fire, may, if he doubt whether it be any thing more than a bare fancy, feel it too; and be convinced, by putting his hand in it. Which certainly could never be put into such exquisite pain, by a bare *idea* or phantom, unless that the pain be a fancy too: which yet he cannot, when the burn is well, by raising the *idea* of it, bring upon himself again.

Thus I see, whilst I write this, I can change the appearance of the paper; and by designing the letters, tell beforehand what new *idea* it shall exhibit the very next moment, barely by drawing my pen over it: which will neither appear (let me fancy as much as I will), if my hands stand still; or though I move my pen, if my eyes be shut: nor when those characters are once made on the paper, can I choose afterwards but see them as they are; that is, have the *ideas* of such letters as I have made. Whence it is manifest, that they are not barely the sport and play of my own imagination, when I find that the characters, that were made at the pleasure of my own thoughts, do not obey them; nor yet cease to be, whenever I shall fancy it, but continue to affect my senses constantly and regularly, according to the figures I made them. To which if we will add, that the sight of those shall, from another man, draw such sounds, as I beforehand

design they shall stand for; there will be little reason left to doubt, that those words I write, do really exist without me, when they cause a long series of regular sounds to affect my ears, which could not be the effect of my imagination, nor could my memory retain them in that order.

§ 8. *This Certainty is as great as our Condition needs.*

BUT yet, if after all this any one will be so sceptical as to distrust his senses, and to affirm that all we see and hear, feel and taste, think and do, during our whole being, is but the series and deluding appearances of a long dream, whereof there is no reality; and therefore will question the existence of all things, or our knowledge of any thing: I must desire him to consider that if all be a dream, then he doth but dream that he makes the question; and so it is not much matter, that a waking man should answer him. But yet, if he pleases, he may dream that I make him this answer, that *the certainty of things existing in rerum natura*, when we have *the testimony of our senses* for it, is not only *as great* as our frame can attain to, but *as our condition needs*. For our faculties being suited not to the full extent of being, nor to a perfect, clear, comprehensive knowledge of things, free from all doubt and scruple; but to the preservation of us in whom they are; and accommodated to the use of life; they serve to our purpose well enough, if they will but give us certain notice of those things, which are convenient or inconvenient to us. For he that sees a candle burning, and hath experimented the force of its flame, by putting his finger in it, will little doubt that this is something existing without him, which does him harm, and puts him to great pain: which is assurance enough, when no man requires greater certainty to govern his actions by, than what is as certain as his actions themselves. And if our dreamer pleases to try, whether the glowing heat of a glass furnace be barely a wandering imagination in a drowsy man's fancy; by putting his hand into it,

he may perhaps be wakened into a certainty greater than he could wish, that it is something more than bare imagination. So that this evidence is as great as we can desire, being as certain to us as our pleasure or pain, *i. e.* happiness or misery; beyond which we have no concernment, either of knowing or being. Such an assurance of the existence of things without us, is sufficient to direct us in the attaining the good, and avoiding the evil, which is caused by them; which is the important concernment we have of being made acquainted with them.

§ 9. *But reaches no farther than actual Sensation.*
 IN fine, then, when our senses do actually convey into our understandings any *idea*, we cannot but be satisfied that there doth something at that time really exist without us, which doth affect our senses, and by them give notice of itself to our apprehensive faculties, and actually produce that *idea* which we then perceive: and we cannot so far distrust their testimony, as to doubt, that such collections of simple *ideas*, as we have observed by our senses to be united together, do really exist together. But *this knowledge extends as far as the present testimony of our senses*, employed about particular objects that do then affect them, *and no farther.* For if I saw such a collection of simple *ideas*, as is wont to be called *man*, existing together one minute since, and am now alone; I cannot be certain that the same man exists now, since there is no necessary connection of his existence a minute since, with his existence now: by a thousand ways he may cease to be, since I had the testimony of my senses for his existence. And if I cannot be certain, that the man I saw last to day is now in being, I can less be certain that he is so, who hath been longer removed from my senses, and I have not seen since yesterday, or since the last year: and much less can I be certain of the existence of men that I never saw. And, therefore, though it be highly probable, that millions of men do now exist, yet whilst I am alone writing this, I have not that certainty of it which we strictly call knowledge;

though the great likelihood of it puts me past doubt, and it be reasonable for me to do several things upon the confidence that there are men (and men also of my acquaintance, with whom I have to do), now in the world: but this is but probability, not knowledge.

§ 10. *Folly to expect Demonstration in every Thing.*

WHEREBY yet we may observe, how foolish and vain a thing it is, for a man of a narrow knowledge, who having reason given him to judge of the different evidence and probability of things, and to be swayed accordingly; how *vain*, I say, it is to *expect demonstration* and certainty in things not capable of it; and refuse assent to very rational propositions, and act contrary to very plain and clear truths, because they cannot be made out so evident, as to surmount every the least (I will not say reason, but) pretence of doubting. He that in the ordinary affairs of life would admit of nothing but direct plain demonstration, would be sure of nothing in this world, but of perishing quickly. The wholesomeness of his meat or drink, would not give him reason to venture on it: and I would fain know, what it is he could do upon such grounds, as are capable of no doubt, no objection.

§ 11. *Past Existence is known by Memory.*

As when our senses are actually employed about any object, we do know that it does exist; so *by our memory* we may be assured, that heretofore, things that affected our senses, have existed. And thus *we have knowledge of the past existence* of several things, whereof our senses having informed us, our memories still retain the *ideas*; and of this we are past all doubt, so long as we remember well. But this knowledge also reaches no farther than our senses have formerly assured us. Thus seeing water at this instant, it is an unquestionable truth to me, that water doth exist: and remembering that I saw it yesterday, it will also be always true; and as long as my memory retains it, always an undoubted proposition to me, that water did exist the 10th of July 1688, as it will also be

equally true, that a certain number of very fine colours did exist, which at the same time I saw upon a bubble of that water : but being now quite out of the sight both of the water and bubbles too, it is no more certainly known to me that the water doth now exist, than that the bubbles or colours therein do so ; it being no more necessary that water should exist to-day, because it existed yesterday, than that the colours or bubbles exist to-day, because they existed yesterday ; though it be exceedingly much more probable, because water hath been observed to continue long in existence, but bubbles and the colours on them quickly cease to be.

§ 12. *The Existence of Spirits not knowable.*

WHAT *ideas* we have of spirits, and how we come by them, I have already shown. But though we have those *ideas* in our minds, and know we have them there, the having the *ideas* of spirits does not make us *know*, that any such things do exist without us, or that there are any *finite spirits*, or any other spiritual beings but the Eternal God. We have ground from revelation, and several other reasons, to believe with assurance, that there are such creatures : but our senses not being able to discover them, we want the means of knowing their particular existences. For we can no more know, that there are finite spirits really existing, by the *idea* we have of such beings in our minds, than by the *ideas* any one has of fairies, or centaurs, he can come to know that things answering those *ideas* do really exist.

And therefore concerning the existence of finite spirits, as well as several other things, we must content ourselves with the evidence of faith ; but universal certain propositions concerning this matter, are beyond our reach. For however true it may be, *v. g.* that all the intelligent spirits that God ever created, do still exist ; yet it can never make a part of our certain knowledge. These and the like propositions we may assent to as highly probable, but are not, I fear, in this state capable of knowing. We are not then to put

others upon demonstrating, nor ourselves upon search of universal certainty in all those matters, wherein we are not capable of any other knowledge, but what our senses give us in this or that particular.

§ 13. *Particular Propositions concerning Existences are knowable.*

By which it appears, that there are two sorts of *propositions*. 1. There is one sort of propositions concerning the *existence* of any thing answerable to such an *idea*: as having the *idea* of an *elephant*, *phœnix*, *motion*, or an *angle*, in my mind, the first and natural inquiry is, whether such a thing does any where exist? And this knowledge is only of *particulars*. No existence of any thing without us, but only of God, can certainly be known farther than our senses inform us. 2. There is another sort of *propositions*, wherein is expressed the agreement or disagreement of our abstract *ideas*, and their dependence one on another. Such propositions may be *universal* and certain. So, having the *idea* of God and myself, of fear and obedience, I cannot but be sure that God is to be feared and obeyed by me: and this proposition will be certain, concerning *man* in general, if I have made an abstract *idea* of such a species, whereof I am one particular. But yet this proposition, how certain soever, that men ought to fear and obey God, proves not to me the existence of men in the world, but will be true of all such creatures whenever they do exist: which *certainty* of such general propositions, depends on the agreement or disagreement is to be discovered in those abstract *ideas*.

§ 14. *And general Propositions concerning abstract Ideas.*

IN the former case, our knowledge is the consequence of the existence of things producing *ideas* in our minds by our senses: in the latter, knowledge is the consequence of the *ideas* (be they what they will), that are in our minds producing there general certain propositions. Many of these are called *eternæ veritates*, and all of them indeed are so; not from being written all

or any of them in the minds of all men, or that they were any of them propositions in any one's mind, till he, having got the abstract *ideas*, joined or separated them by affirmation or negation. But wheresoever we can suppose such a creature as *man* is, endowed with such faculties, and thereby furnished with such *ideas* as we have, we must conclude, he must needs, when he applies his thoughts to the consideration of his *ideas*, know the truth of certain propositions, that will arise from the agreement or disagreement which he will perceive in his own *ideas*. Such propositions are therefore called *eternal truths*, not because they are eternal propositions actually formed, and antecedent to the understanding, that any time makes them; nor because they are imprinted on the mind from any patterns, that are any where of them out of the mind, and existed before: but because being once made about abstract *ideas* so as to be true, they will, whenever they can be supposed, to be made again at any time past or to come, by a mind having those *ideas*, always actually be true. For names being supposed to stand perpetually for the same *ideas*, and the same *ideas* having immutably the same habitudes one to another; propositions concerning any abstract *ideas*, that are once true, must needs be *eternal verities*.

CHAP. XII.

OF THE IMPROVEMENT OF OUR KNOWLEDGE.

§ 1. *Knowledge is not from Maxims.*

IT having been the common received opinion amongst men of letters, that *maxims* were the foundation of all knowledge; and that the sciences were each of them built upon certain *præcognita*, from whence the understanding was to take its rise, and by which it was to conduct itself, in its inquiries into the matters belonging to that science; the beaten road of the schools has been, to lay down in the beginning one or more general propositions, as foundations where-

on to build the knowledge that was to be had of that subject. These doctrines thus laid down for foundations of any science, were called *principles*, as the beginnings from which we must set out, and look no farther backwards in our inquiries, as we have already observed.

§ 2. (*The occasion of that opinion.*)

ONE thing, which might probably give an occasion to this way of proceeding in other sciences, was (as I suppose) the good success it seemed to have in *mathematics*, wherein men, being observed to attain a great certainty of knowledge, these sciences came by pre-eminence to be called *Μαθηματα* and *Μάθησις*, learning, or things learned, thoroughly learned, as having of all others the greatest certainty, clearness and evidence in them.

§ 3. (*But from the comparing clear and distinct Ideas.*)

BUT if any one will consider, he will (I guess) find that the *great advancement* and certainty of *real knowledge*, which men arrived to in these sciences, was not owing to the influence of these principles, nor derived from any peculiar advantage they received from two or three general maxims, laid down in the beginning; but from the *clear, distinct, complete ideas* their thoughts were employed about, and the relation of equality and excess so clear between some of them, that they had an intuitive knowledge, and by that a way to discover it in others, and this without the help of those *maxims*. For I ask, is it not possible for a young lad to know, that his whole body is bigger than his little finger, but by virtue of this axiom, that *the whole is bigger than a part*; nor be assured of it, till he has learned that *maxim*? Or cannot a country-wench know, that having received a shilling from one that owes her three, and a shilling also from another that owes her three, that the remaining debts in each of their hands are equal? Cannot she know this, I say, without she fetch the certainty of it from this maxim, that *if you take equals from equals, the remainder will be equals*, a maxim which possibly she

never heard or thought of? I desire any one to consider, from what has been elsewhere said, which is known first and clearest by most people, the particular instance, or the general rule; and which it is that gives life and birth to the other. These general rules are but the comparing our more general and abstract *ideas*, which are the workmanship of the mind made, and names given to them, for the easier dispatch in its reasonings, and drawing into comprehensive terms, and short rules, its various and multiplied observations. But knowledge began in the mind, and was founded on particulars; though afterwards, perhaps, no notice be taken thereof: it being natural for the mind (forward still to enlarge its knowledge), most attentively to lay up those general notions, and make the proper use of them, which is to disburden the memory of the cumbersome load of particulars. For I desire it may be considered what more certainty there is to a child, or any one, that his body, little finger and all, is bigger than his little finger alone, after you have given to his body the name *whole*, and to his little finger the name *part*, than he could have had before; or what new knowledge concerning his body, can these two relative terms give him, which he could not have without them? Could he not know that his body was bigger than his little finger, if his language were yet so imperfect, that he had no such relative terms as *whole* and *part*? I ask farther, when he has got these names, how is he more certain that his body is a *whole*, and his little finger a *part*, than he was or might be certain, before he learned these terms, that his body was bigger than his little finger? Any one may as reasonably doubt or deny that his little finger is a part of his body, as that it is less than his body. And he that can doubt whether it be less, will as certainly doubt whether it be a part. So that the maxim, *the whole is bigger than a part*, can never be made use of to prove the little finger less than the body, but when it is useless, by being brought to convince one of a truth which he knows already. For he that does

not know that any parcel of matter, with another parcel of matter joined to it, is bigger than either of them alone, will never be able to know it by the help of these two relative terms, *whole* and *part*, make of them what maxim you please.

§ 4. *Dangerous to build upon precarious Principles.* BUT be it in the mathematics as it will, whether it be clearer, that taking an inch from a black line of two inches, and an inch from a red line of two inches, the remaining parts of the two lines will be equal, or that *if you take equals from equals, the remainder will be equals*: which, I say, of these two is the clearer and first known, I leave to any one to determine, it not being material to my present occasion. That which I have here to do, is to inquire, whether if it be the readiest way to knowledge to begin with general maxims, and build upon them, it be yet a safe way to take the principles which are laid down in any other science as unquestionable truths; and so receive them without examination, and adhere to them, without suffering to be doubted of, because mathematicians have been so happy, or so fair, to use none but self-evident and undeniable. If this be so, I know not what may not pass for truth in morality, what may not be introduced and proved in natural philosophy.

Let that principle of some of the philosophers, that all is matter, and that there is nothing else; be received for certain and indubitable, and it will be easy to be seen by the writings of some that have revived it again in our days, what consequences it will lead us into. Let any one, with *Polemo*, take the world; or with the *stoics*, the *ether*, or the sun; or with *Anaximenes*, the air to be *God*; and what a divinity, religion and worship must we needs have! *Nothing can be so dangerous as principles thus taken up without questioning or examination*; especially if they be such as concern morality, which influence mens lives, and give a bias to all their actions. Who might not justly expect another kind of life in *Aristippus*, who placed happiness in bodily pleasure; and in *Antisthenes*, who

made virtue sufficient to felicity? And he who, with *Plato*, shall place beatitude in the knowledge of God, will have his thoughts raised to other contemplations than those who looked not beyond this spot of earth, and those perishing things which are to be had in it. He that with *Archelaus* shall lay it down as a principle, that right and wrong, honest and dishonest, are defined only by laws, and not by nature, will have other measures of moral rectitude and pravity than those who take it for granted, that we are under obligations antecedent to all human constitutions.

§ 5. *This is no certain way to Truth.*

IF, therefore, those that pass for *principles*, are *not certain* (which we must have some way to know, that we may be able to distinguish them from those that are doubtful), but are only made so to us by our blind assent, we are liable to be misled by them; and instead of being guided into truth, we shall, by principles, be only confirmed in mistake and error.

§ 6. *But to compare clear complete Ideas under steady Names.*

BUT since the knowledge of the certainty of principles, as well as of all other truths, depends only upon the perception we have of the agreement or disagreement of our *ideas*, the way to improve our knowledge, is not, I am sure, blindly, and with an implicit faith, to receive and swallow principles; but is, I think, to get and fix in our minds clear, distinct and complete ideas, as far as they are to be had, and annex to them proper and constant names. And thus, perhaps, without any other principles, but barely considering those *ideas*, and by comparing them one with another, finding their agreement and disagreement, and their several relations and habitudes; we shall get more true and clear knowledge, by the conduct of this one rule, than by taking up principles, and thereby putting our minds into the disposal of others.

§ 7. *The true Method of advancing Knowledge is by considering our abstract Ideas.*

WE must therefore, if we will proceed, as reason advises, adapt our methods of inquiry to the nature of the ideas we examine, and the truth we search after. General and certain truths are only founded in the habitudes and relations of abstract ideas. A sagacious and methodical application of our thoughts, for the finding out these relations, is the only way to discover all that can be put, with truth and certainty concerning them, into general propositions. By what steps we are to proceed in these, is to be learned in the schools of the mathematicians, who from very plain and easy beginnings, by gentle degrees, and a continued chain of reasonings, proceed to the discovery and demonstration of truths, that appear at first sight beyond human capacity. The art of finding proofs, and the admirable methods they have invented for the singling out, and laying in order those intermediate ideas, that demonstratively show the equality or inequality of unapplicable quantities, is that which has carried them so far, and produced such wonderful and unexpected discoveries: but whether something like this, in respect of other ideas, as well as those of magnitude, may not in time be found out, I will not determine. This, I think, I may say, that if other ideas, that are the real as well as the nominal essences of their species, were pursued in the way familiar to mathematicians, they would carry our thoughts farther, and with greater evidence and clearness than possibly we are apt to imagine.

§ 8. *By which Morality also may be made clearer.* THIS gave me the confidence to advance that conjecture, which I suggest, chap. 3. viz. that morality is capable of demonstration, as well as mathematics. For the ideas that ethics are conversant about being all real essences, and such as I imagine have a discoverable connection and agreement one with another; so far as we can find their habitudes and relations, so far we shall be possessed of certain, real and general

truths: and I doubt not, but if a right method were taken, a great part of morality might be made out with that clearness that could leave to a considering man, no more reason to doubt, than he could have to doubt of the truth of propositions in mathematics, which have been demonstrated to him.

§ 9. *But Knowledge of Bodies is to be improved only by Experience.*

IN our search after the knowledge of *substances*, our want of *ideas*, that are suitable to such a way of proceeding, obliges us to a quite different method. We advance not here as in the other (where our abstract *ideas* are real as well as nominal essences), by contemplating our *ideas*, and considering their relations and correspondences; that helps us very little, for the reasons, that in another place we have at large set down. By which, I think it is evident, that substances afford matter of very little general knowledge; and the bare contemplation of their abstract *ideas*, will carry us but a very little way in the search of truth and certainty. What then are we to do for the improvement of our *knowledge in substantial beings*? Here we are to take a quite contrary course: the want of *ideas* of their real *essences*, sends us from our own thoughts, to the things themselves, as they exist. *Experience here must teach me*, what reason cannot; and it is by trying alone, that I can certainly know, what other qualities co-exist with those of my complex *idea*, v. g. whether that *yellow, heavy, fusible* body, I call *gold*, be *malleable*, or no; which experience (which way ever it prove, in that particular body, I examine) makes me not certain, that it is so in all, or any other *yellow, heavy, fusible* bodies, but that which I have tried. Because it is no consequence one way or the other from my complex *idea*; the necessity or inconsistency of *malleability* hath no visible connection with the combination of that *colour, weight* and *fusibility* in any body. What I have said here of the nominal essence of *gold*, supposed to consist of a body of such a determinate *colour, weight* and *fusibility*,

will hold true, if *malleableness*, *fixedness*, and *solubility* in *aqua regia* be added to it. Our reasonings from these *ideas* will carry us but a little way in the certain discovery of the other properties in those masses of matter wherein all these are to be found. Because the other properties of such bodies, depending not on these, but on that unknown real essence, on which these also depend, we cannot by them discover the rest; we can go no farther than the simple *ideas* of our nominal essence will carry us, which is very little beyond themselves; and so afford us but very sparingly any certain, universal and useful truths. For upon trial having found that particular piece (and all others of that colour, weight and fusibility that I ever tried) *malleable*, that also makes now perhaps a part of my complex *idea*, part of my nominal essence of *gold*: Whereby though I make my complex *idea*, to which I affix the name *gold*, to consist of more simple *ideas* than before; yet still, it not containing the real essence of any species of bodies, it helps me not certainly to know (I say to know, perhaps it may to conjecture) the other remaining properties of that body, farther than they have a visible connection with some or all of the simple *ideas*, that make up my nominal essence. For example, I cannot be certain from this complex *idea*, whether *gold* be fixed, or no; because, as before, there is no necessary connection or inconsistency to be discovered betwixt a complex *idea* of a body, *yellow*, *heavy*, *fusible*, *malleable*; betwixt these, I say, and *fixedness*: So that I may certainly know, that in whatsoever body these are found, there *fixedness* is sure to be. Here again for assurance, I must apply myself to *experience*; as far as that reaches, I may have certain knowledge, but no farther.

§ 10. *This may procure us convenience, not Science.*
 I DENY not but a man, accustomed to rational and regular experiments, shall be able to see farther into the nature of bodies, and guess righter at their yet unknown properties, than one that is a stranger to them: But yet, as I have said, this is but judgment and opi-

nion, not knowledge and certainty. This way of getting, and improving our knowledge in substances only by experience and history, which is all that the weakness of our faculties in this state of *mediocrity*, which we are in in this world, can attain to, makes me suspect, that natural philosophy is not capable of being made a science. We are able, I imagine, to reach very little general knowledge concerning the species of bodies, and their several properties. Experiments and historical observations we may have, from which we may draw advantages of ease and health, and thereby increase our stock of conveniences for this life; but beyond this I fear our talents reach not, nor are our faculties, as I guess, able to advance.

§ 11. *We are fitted for moral Knowledge and natural Improvements.*

FROM whence it is obvious to conclude, that since our faculties are not fitted to penetrate into the internal fabric, and real essences of bodies; but yet plainly discover to us the being of a God, and the knowledge of ourselves, enough to lead us into a full and clear discovery of our duty, and great concernment; it will become us, as rational creatures, to employ those faculties we have, about what they are adapted to, and follow the direction of nature, where it seems to point us out the way. For it is rational to conclude, that our proper employment lies in those inquiries, and in that sort of knowledge which is most suited to our natural capacities, and carries in it our greatest interest, *i. e.* the condition of our eternal estate. Hence I think I may conclude, that *morality is the proper science, and business of mankind in general* (who are both concerned, and fitted to search out their *summum bonum*); as several arts, conversant about several parts of nature, are the lot and private talent of particular men, for the common use of human life, and their own particular subsistence in this world. Of what consequence the discovery of one natural body, and its properties may be to human life, the whole great continent of America is a convincing instance: whose

ignorance in useful arts, and want of the greatest part of the conveniences of life, in a country that abounded with all sorts of natural plenty, I think, may be attributed to their ignorance, of what was to be found in a very ordinary despicable stone, I mean the mineral of *iron*. And whatever we think of our parts or improvements in this part of the world, where knowledge and plenty seem to vie each with other; yet to any one that will seriously reflect on it, I suppose, it will appear past doubt, that were the use of *iron* lost among us, we should in a few ages be unavoidably reduced to the wants and ignorance of the ancient savage Americans, whose natural endowments and provisions come no way short of those of the most flourishing and polite nations. So that he who first made known the use of that one contemptible mineral, may be truly styled the father of arts, and author of plenty.

§ 12. *But must beware of Hypotheses and wrong Principles.*

I WOULD not therefore be thought to disesteem, or *disuade the study of nature*. I readily agree the contemplation of his works gives us occasion to admire, revere, and glorify their Author: and if rightly directed, may be of greater benefit to mankind, than the monuments of exemplary charity, that have at so great charge been raised by the founders of hospitals and almshouses. He that first invented printing, discovered the use of the compass, or made public the virtue and right use of *kin kina*, did more for the propagation of knowledge, for the supplying and increase of useful commodities, and saved more from the grave, than those who built colleges, work-houses and hospitals. All that I would say, is, that we should not be too forwardly possessed with the opinion, or expectation of knowledge, where it is not to be had; or by ways that will not attain it: That we should not take doubtful systems for complete sciences, nor unintelligible notions for scientific demonstrations. In the knowledge of bodies, we must be content to glean what

we can from particular experiments : Since we cannot, from a discovery of their real essences, grasp at a time whole sheaves ; and in bundles comprehend the nature and properties of whole species together. Where our inquiry is concerning co-existence, or repugnancy to co-exist, which by contemplation of our *ideas* we cannot discover ; there experience, observation and natural history, must give us by our senses, and by retail, an insight into corporeal substances. The knowledge of bodies we must get by our senses, warily employed in taking notice of their qualities and operations on one another : And what we hope to know of separate spirits in this world, we must, I think, expect only from revelation. He that shall consider *how little general maxims, precarious principles, and hypotheses laid down at pleasure, have promoted true knowledge*, or helped to satisfy the inquiries of rational men after real improvements ; how little, I say, the setting out at that end has, for many ages together, advanced mens progress towards the knowledge of natural philosophy, will think we have reason to thank those, who in this latter age have taken another course, and have trod out to us, though not an easier way to learned ignorance, yet a surer way to profitable knowledge.

§ 13. *The true use of Hypotheses.*

Not that we may not, to explain any *phenomena* of nature, make use of any probable *hypothesis* whatsoever : *Hypotheses*, if they are well made, are at least great helps to the memory, and often direct us to new discoveries. But my meaning is, that we should *not take up any one too hastily* (which the mind, that would always penetrate into the causes of things, and have principles to rest on, is very apt to do), till we have very well examined particulars, and made several experiments, in that thing which we would explain by our hypothesis, and see whether it will agree to them all ; whether our principles will carry us quite through, and not be as inconsistent with one *phenomenon* of nature, as they seem to accommodate, and explain ano-

ther. And at least that we take care, that the name of *principles* deceive us not, nor impose on us, by making us receive that for an unquestionable truth, which is really, at best, but a very doubtful conjecture, such as are most (I had almost said all) of the *hypotheses* in natural philosophy.

§ 14. *Clear and distinct Ideas with settled Names, and the finding of those which show their Agreement or Disagreement, are the ways to enlarge our Knowledge.*

BUT whether natural philosophy be capable of certainty or no, the ways to enlarge our knowledge, as far as we are capable, seem to me, in short, to be these two:

First, The first is to get and settle in our minds determined ideas of those things, whereof we have general or specific names; at least of so many of them as we would consider and improve our knowledge in, or reason about. And if they be *specific* ideas of *substances*, we should endeavour also to make them as complete as we can, whereby I mean, that we should put together as many simple ideas, as being constantly observed to co-exist, may perfectly determine the *species*: And each of those simple ideas, which are the ingredients of our complex ones, should be clear and distinct in our minds. For it being evident, that our knowledge cannot exceed our ideas; as far as they are either imperfect, confused, or obscure, we cannot expect to have certain, perfect or clear knowledge.

Secondly, The other is the art of finding out those intermediate ideas, which may show us the agreement or repugnancy of other ideas, which cannot be immediately compared.

§ 15. *Mathematics, an Instance of it.*

THAT these two (and not the relying on maxims, and drawing consequences from some general propositions) are the right method of improving our knowledge in the ideas of other modes besides those of quantity, the consideration of mathematical knowledge will easily inform us. Where first we shall find, that he that has not a perfect and clear idea of

those angles, or figures of which he desires to know any thing, is utterly thereby incapable of any knowledge about them. Suppose but a man, not to have a perfect exact *idea* of a *right angle*, a *scalenum*, or *trapezium*; and there is nothing more certain, than that he will in vain seek any demonstration about them. Farther, it is evident, that it was not the influence of those maxims, which are taken for principles in mathematics, that hath led the masters of that science into those wonderful discoveries they have made. Let a man of good parts know all the maxims generally made use of in mathematics never so perfectly, and contemplate their extent and consequences as much as he pleases, he will by their assistance, I suppose, scarce ever come to know that *the square of the hypotenuse in a right angled triangle, is equal to the squares of the two other sides*. The knowledge, that *the whole is equal to all its parts*, and if you take equals from equals, the remainder will be equal, &c. helped him not, I presume, to this demonstration: And a man may, I think, pore long enough on those axioms, without ever seeing one jot the more of mathematical truths. They have been discovered by the thoughts otherwise applied: The mind had other objects, other views before it, far different from those maxims, when it first got the knowledge of such kind of truths in mathematics, which men well enough acquainted with those received axioms, but ignorant of their method, who first made these demonstrations, can never sufficiently admire. And who knows what methods, to enlarge our knowledge in other parts of science, may hereafter be invented, answering that of *algebra* in mathematics, which so readily finds out *ideas* of quantities to measure others by; whose equality or proportion we could otherwise very hardily, or, perhaps, never come to know?

CHAP. XIII.

SOME FARTHER CONSIDERATIONS CONCERNING OUR KNOWLEDGE.

§ 1. *Our Knowledge partly necessary, partly voluntary.*

OUR knowledge, as in other things, so in this, has a great conformity with our sight, that it is *neither wholly necessary, nor wholly voluntary*. If our knowledge were altogether necessary, all mens knowledge would not only be alike, but every man would know all that is knowable: and if it were wholly voluntary, some men so little regard or value it, that they would have extreme little, or none at all. Men that have senses cannot choose but receive some *ideas* by them; and if they have memory, they cannot but retain some of them; and if they have any distinguishing faculty, cannot but perceive the agreement or disagreement of some of them one with another: as he that has eyes, if he will open them by day, cannot but see some objects, and perceive a difference in them. But though a man, with his eyes open in the light, cannot but see, yet there be certain objects, which he may choose whether he will turn his eyes to; there may be in his reach a book containing pictures and discourses, capable to delight or instruct him, which yet he may never have the will to open, never take the pains to look into.

§ 2. *The Application voluntary; but we know as things are, not as we please.*

THERE is also another thing in a man's power, and that is, though he turns his eyes sometimes towards an object, yet he may choose whether he will curiously survey it, and with an intent application endeavour to observe accurately all that is visible in it. But yet what he does see, he cannot see otherwise than he does. It depends not on his will to see that *black* which appears *yellow*; nor to persuade himself, that what actually *scalds* him, feels *cold*. The earth will not appear painted with flowers, nor the fields covered with verdure, whenever he has a mind to it: in the cold winter, he cannot help seeing it white

146 *Considerations concerning our Knowledge. Book IV.*
 and hoary, if he will look abroad. Just thus is it with our understanding; all that is *voluntary* in our knowledge, is the *employing* or with-holding any of our *faculties* from this or that sort of objects, and a more or less accurate survey of them: but they being employed, *our will hath no power to determine the knowledge of the mind* one way or other; that is done only by the objects themselves, as far as they are clearly discovered. And therefore, as far as mens senses are conversant about external objects, the mind cannot but receive those *ideas*, which are presented by them, and be informed of the existence of things without: and so far as men's thoughts converse with their own determined *ideas*, they cannot but, in some measure, observe the agreement and disagreement that is to be found amongst some of them, which is so far knowledge: and if they have names for those *ideas* which they have thus considered, they must needs be assured of the truth of those propositions, which express that agreement or disagreement they perceive in them, and be undoubtedly convinced of those truths. For what a man sees, he cannot but see; and what he perceives, he cannot but know that he perceives.

§ 3. *Instance—In Numbers.*

THUS he that has got the *ideas* of numbers, and hath taken the pains to compare *one, two and three, to six*, cannot choose but know that they are equal: he that hath got the *idea* of a triangle, and found the ways to measure its angles, and their magnitudes, is certain that its three angles are equal to two right ones; and can as little doubt of that, as of this truth, that *it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be.*

In Natural Religion.

He also that hath the *idea* of an intelligent, but frail and weak being, made by and depending on another, who is eternal, omnipotent, perfectly wise and good, will as certainly know that man is to honour, fear and obey GOD, as that the sun shines when he sees it. For if he hath but the *ideas* of two such beings in his mind, and will turn his thoughts that way, and consider them, he will as certainly find that the inferior, finite and de-

Chap. 13. *Considerations concerning our Knowledge.* 147

pendant, is under an obligation to obey the Supreme and Infinite, as he is certain to find, that *three, four and seven* are less than *fifteen*, if he will consider and compute those numbers; nor can he be surer in a clear morning that the sun is risen, if he will but open his eyes, and turn them that way. But yet these truths, being never so certain, never so clear, he may be ignorant of either, or all of them, who will never take the pains to employ his faculties, as he should, to inform himself about them.

CHAP. XIV.

OF JUDGMENT.

§ 1. *Our Knowledge being short, we want something else.*

THE understanding faculties being given to man, not barely for speculation, but also for the conduct of his life, man would be at a great loss, if he had nothing to direct him but what has the certainty of true knowledge. For that being very short and scanty, as we have seen, he would be often utterly in the dark, and in most of the actions of his life, perfectly at a stand, had he nothing to guide him in the absence of clear and certain knowledge. He that will not eat, till he has demonstration that it will nourish him; he that will not stir, till he infallibly knows the business he goes about will succeed; will have little else to do, but sit still and perish.

§ 2. *What use to be made of this twilight State.*

THEREFORE, as God has set some things in broad daylight; as he has given us some certain knowledge, though limited to a few things in comparison, probably as a taste of what intellectual creatures are capable of, to excite in us a desire and endeavour after a better state: So in the greatest part of our concernment, he has afforded us only the twilight, as I may so say, of *probability*; suitable, I presume, to that state of mediocrity and probationership, he has been pleased to place us in here; wherein, to check our over-confidence and presumption,

we might by every day's experience be made sensible of our short-sightedness and liableness to error; the sense whereof might be a constant admonition to us, to spend the days of this our pilgrimage with industry and care, in the search and following of that way, which might lead us to a state of greater perfection: It being highly rational to think, even were revelation silent in the case, that as men employ those talents God has given them here, they shall accordingly receive their rewards at the close of the day, when their sun shall set, and night shall put an end to their labours.

§ 3. *Judgment supplies the want of Knowledge.*

THE faculty which God has given man to supply the want of clear and certain knowledge, in cases where that cannot be had, is *judgment*, whereby the mind takes its *ideas* to agree or disagree; or which is the same, any proposition to be true or false, without perceiving a demonstrative evidence in the proofs. The mind sometimes exercises this *judgment* out of necessity, where demonstrative proofs, and certain knowledge are not to be had; and sometimes out of laziness, unskilfulness, or haste, even where demonstrative and certain proofs are to be had. Men often stay not warily to examine the agreement or disagreement of two *ideas*, which they are desirous or concerned to know; but either incapable of such attention as is requisite in a long train of gradations, or impatient of delay, lightly cast their eyes on, or wholly pass by the proofs; and so, without making out the demonstration, determine of the agreement or disagreement of two *ideas*, as it were by a view of them as they are at a distance, and take it to be the one or the other, as seems most likely to them upon such a loose survey. This faculty of the mind, when it is exercised immediately about things, is called *judgment*; when about truths delivered in words, is most commonly called *assent* or *dissent*; which being the most usual way, wherein the mind has occasion to employ this faculty, I shall under these terms treat of it, as least liable in our language to *equivocation*.

§ 4. *Judgment is the presuming things to be so, without perceiving it.*

Thus the mind has two faculties, conversant about truth and falsehood.

First, Knowledge, whereby it certainly perceives, and is undoubtedly satisfied of the agreement or disagreement of any *ideas*.

Secondly, Judgment, which is the putting *ideas* together, or separating them from one another in the mind, when their certain agreement or disagreement is not perceived, but presumed to be so; which is as the word imports, taken to be so, before it certainly appears. And if it so unites, or separates them, as in reality things are, it is *right judgment*.

CHAP. XV.

OF PROBABILITY.

§ 1. *Probability is the Appearance of Agreement upon fallible Proofs.*

AS demonstration is the showing the agreement or disagreement of two *ideas*, by the intervention of one or more proofs, which have a constant, immutable, and visible connection one with another; so *probability* is nothing but the appearance of such an agreement or disagreement, by the intervention of proofs, whose connection is not constant and immutable, or at least is not perceived to be so, but is, or appears for the most part to be so, and is enough to induce the mind to *judge* the proposition to be true or false, rather than the contrary. For example: In the demonstration of it, a man perceives the certain immutable connection there is of equality between the three angles of a *triangle*, and those intermediate ones which are made use of to show their equality to two right ones; and so by an intuitive knowledge of the agreement or disagreement of the intermediate *ideas* in each step of the progress, the whole series is continued with an evidence, which clearly shows the agreement or disagreement of those three angles in equality to two right ones: And thus he has certain know-

ledge that it is so. But another man, who never took the pains to observe the demonstration, hearing a mathematician, a man of credit, affirm the three angles of a triangle to be equal to two right ones, *assents* to it, i. e. receives it for true. In which case the foundation of his assent is the probability of the thing, the proof being such as for the most part carries truth with it: the man, on whose testimony he receives it, not being wont to affirm any thing contrary to, or besides his knowledge, especially in matters of this kind. So that that which causes his assent to this proposition, that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right ones, that which makes him take these *ideas* to agree, without knowing them to do so, is the wonted veracity of the speaker in other cases, or his supposed veracity in this.

§ 2. *It is to supply the want of Knowledge.*

OUR knowledge, as has been shown, being very narrow, and we not happy enough to find certain truth in every thing which we have occasion to consider; most of the propositions we think, reason, discourse, nay, act upon, are such as we cannot have undoubted knowledge of their truth: yet some of them border so near upon certainty, that we make no doubt at all about them; but *assent* to them as firmly, and act, according to that assent, as resolutely as if they were infallibly demonstrated, and that our knowledge of them was perfect and certain. But there being degrees herein from the very neighbourhood of certainty and demonstration, quite down to improbability and unlikeliness, even to the confines of impossibility: and also degrees of *assent* from full assurance and confidence, quite down to conjecture, doubt, and distrust: I shall come now (having, as I think, found out the bounds of human knowledge and certainty), in the next place, to consider the several degrees and grounds of probability, and assent or faith.

§ 3. *Being that which makes us presume things to be true before we know them to be so.*

PROBABILITY is likeliness to be true, the very notation of the word signifying such a proposition, for which there be arguments or proofs, to make it pass or be re-

ceived for true. The entertainment the mind gives this sort of propositions, is called *belief, assent, or opinion*, which is the admitting or receiving any proposition for true, upon arguments or proofs that are found to persuade us to receive it as true, without certain knowledge that it is so. And herein lies the *difference between probability, and certainty, faith and knowledge*, that in all the parts of knowledge there is intuition; each immediate *idea*, each step has its visible and certain connection; in belief, not so. That which makes me believe, is something extraneous to the thing I believe; something not evidently joined on both sides to, and so not manifestly showing the agreement or disagreement of those *ideas* that are under consideration.

§ 4. *The Grounds of Probability are two; Conformity with our own Experience, or the Testimony of others experienced.*

PROBABILITY then, being to supply the defect of our knowledge, and to guide us where that fails, is always conversant about propositions, whereof we have no certainty, but only some inducements to receive them for true. The grounds of it are, in short, these two following.

First, The conformity of any thing with our own knowledge, observation, and experience.

Secondly, The testimony of others, vouching their observation and experience. In the testimony of others is to be considered, 1. The number. 2. The integrity. 3. The skill of the witnesses. 4. The design of the author, where it is a testimony out of a book cited. 5. The consistency of the parts, and circumstances of the relation. 6. Contrary testimonies.

§ 5. *In this all the Agreements pro and con, ought to be examined before we come to a judgment.*

PROBABILITY wanting that intuitive evidence, which infallibly determines the understanding, and produces certain knowledge, the mind, if it would proceed rationally, ought to examine all the grounds of probability, and see how they make more or less, for or against any proposition, before it assents to or dissents from it; and upon a due

balancing the whole, reject, or receive it, with a more or less firm assent, proportionably to the preponderancy of the greater grounds of probability on one side or the other. For example :

If I myself see a man walk on the ice, it is past *probability*, it is knowledge : but if another tells me he saw a man in *England* in the midst of a sharp winter, walk upon water hardened with cold ; this has so great conformity with what is usually observed to happen, that I am disposed by the nature of the thing itself to assent to it, unless some manifest suspicion attend the relation of that matter of fact. But if the same thing be told to one born between the tropics, who never saw nor heard of any such thing before, there the whole probability relies on testimony : And as the relators are more in number, and of more credit, and have no interest to speak contrary to the truth ; so that matter of fact is like to find more or less belief. Though to a man, whose experience has been always quite contrary, and has never heard of any thing like it, the most untainted credit of a witness will scarce be able to find belief. As it happened to a *Dutch* ambassador, who entertaining the king of *Siam* with the particularities of *Holland*, which he was inquisitive after, amongst other things told him, that the water in his country would sometimes, in cold weather, be so hard, that men walked upon it, and that it would bear an elephant if he were there. To which the king replied, *Hitherto I have believed the strange things you have told me, because I look upon you as a sober fair man, but now I am sure you lie.*

§ 6. *They being capable of great Variety.*

UPON these grounds depends the *probability* of any proposition : And as the conformity of our knowledge, as the certainty of observations, as the frequency and constancy of experience, and the number and credibility of testimonies, do more or less agree or disagree with it, so is any proposition in itself more or less probable. There is another, I confess, which though by itself it be no true ground of *probability*, yet is often made use of for one, by which men most commonly regulate their as-

sent, and upon which they pin their faith more than any thing else, and that is the opinion of others: Though there cannot be a more dangerous thing to rely on, nor more likely to mislead one; since there is much more falsehood and error among men, than truth and knowledge. And if the opinions and persuasions of others, whom we know and think well of, be a ground of assent, men have reason to be heathens in *Japan*, Mahometans in *Turkey*, Papists in *Spain*, Protestants in *England*, and Lutherans in *Sweden*. But of this wrong ground of assent, I shall have occasion to speak more at large in another place.

CHAP. XVI.

OF THE DEGREES OF ASSENT.

§ 1. *Our Assent ought to be regulated by the Grounds of Probability.*

THE grounds of probability we have laid down in the foregoing chapter; as they are the foundations on which our *assent* is built, so are they also the measure whereby its several degrees are, or ought to be *regulated*: only we are to take notice, that whatever grounds of probability there may be, they yet operate no further on the mind, which searches after truth, and endeavours to judge right, than they appear, at least in the first judgment or search that the mind makes. I confess, in the opinions men have, and firmly stick to, in the world, their *assent* is not always from an actual view of the reasons that at first prevailed with them: It being in many cases almost impossible, and in most very hard, even for those who have very admirable memories, to retain all the proofs, which upon a due examination made them embrace that side of the question. It suffices that they have once with care and fairness sifted the matter as far as they could; and that they have searched into all the particulars, that they could imagine to give any light to the question; and with the best of their skill cast up the account upon the whole evidence: and thus having once found, on which side

the probability appeared to them, after as full and exact an inquiry, as they can make, they lay up the conclusion in their memories, as a truth they have discovered; and for the future they remain satisfied with the testimony of their memories, that this is the opinion, that by the proofs they have once seen of it, deserves such a degree of their assent as they afford it.

§ 2. *These cannot always be actually in view, and then we must content ourselves with the remembrance that we once saw ground for such a degree of Assent.*

THIS is all that the greatest part of men are capable of doing, in regulating their *opinions* and judgments; unless a man will exact of them, either to retain distinctly in their memories all the proofs concerning any probable truth, and that too in the same order, and regular deduction of consequences in which they have formerly placed or seen them; which sometimes is enough to fill a large volume upon one single question: Or else they must require a man, for every opinion that he embraces, every day to examine the proofs: both which are impossible. It is unavoidable, therefore, that the memory be relied on in the case, and that *men be persuaded of several opinions, whereof the proofs are not actually in their thoughts*; nay, which perhaps they are not able actually to recal. Without this, the greatest part of men must be either very sceptics, or change every moment, and yield themselves up to whoever, having lately studied the question, offers them arguments; which, for want of memory, they are not able presently to answer.

§ 3. *The ill consequence of this, if our former Judgment were not rightly made.*

I CANNOT but own, that mens *sticking* to their *past judgment*, and adhering firmly to conclusions formerly made, is often the cause of great obstinacy in error and mistake. But the fault is not that they rely on their memories, for what they have before well judged; but because they judged before they had well examined. May we not find a great number (not to say the greatest part) of men, that think they have formed right judgments of several matters, and that for no other reason,

but because they never thought otherwise? That imagine themselves to have judged right, only because they never questioned, never examined their own opinions? Which is indeed to think they judged right, because they never judged at all: And yet these of all men hold their opinions with the greatest stiffness; those being generally the most fierce and firm in their tenets, who have least examined them. What we once know, we are certain is so; and we may be secure, that there are no latent proofs undiscovered, which may overturn our knowledge, or bring it in doubt. But in matters of probability, it is not in every case we can be sure that we have all the particulars before us, that any way concern the question; and that there is no evidence behind, and yet unseen, which may cast the probability on the other side, and outweigh all that at present seems to preponderate with us. Who almost is there that hath the leisure, patience, and means, to collect together all the proofs concerning most of the opinions he has, so as safely to conclude that he hath a clear and full view; and that there is no more to be alleged for his better information? And yet we are forced to determine ourselves on the one side or other. The conduct of our lives, and the management of our great concerns, will not bear delay: for those depend, for the most part, on the determination of our judgment in points wherein we are not capable of certain and demonstrative knowledge, and wherein it is necessary for us to embrace the one side or the other.

§ 4. *The right use of it, mutual Charity and Forbearance.*

SINCE, therefore, it is unavoidable to the greatest part of men, if not all, to have several *opinions*, without certain and indubitable proofs of their truths; and it carries too great an imputation of ignorance, lightness, or folly, for men to quit and renounce their former tenets presently upon the offer of an argument, which they cannot immediately answer, and show the insufficiency of: it would methinks become all men to maintain *peace*, and the common offices of humanity and friendship, in the

diversity of opinions : since we cannot reasonably expect, that any one should readily and obsequiously quit his own opinion, and embrace ours, with a blind resignation to an authority, which the understanding of man acknowledges not. For however it may often mistake, it can own no other guide but reason, nor blindly submit to the will and dictates of another. If he, you would bring over to your sentiments, be one that examines before he assents, you must give him leave at his leisure to go over the account again, and recalling what is out of his mind, examine all the particulars, to see on which side the advantage lies : And if he will not think our arguments of weight enough to engage him a-new in so much pains, it is but what we do often ourselves in the like case ; and we should take it amiss, if others should prescribe to us what points we should study. And if he be one who takes his opinions upon trust, how can we imagine that he should renounce those tenets which time and custom have so settled in his mind, that he thinks them self-evident, and of an unquestionable certainty ; or which he takes to be impressions he has received from GOD himself, or from men sent by him ? How can we expect, I say, that opinions thus settled should be given up to the arguments or authority of a stranger, or adversary ; especially if there be any suspicion of interest or design, as there never fails to be, where men find themselves ill treated ? We should do well to commiserate our mutual ignorance, and endeavour to remove it in all the gentle and fair ways of information ; and not instantly treat others ill, as obstinate and perverse, because they will not renounce their own, and receive our opinions, or at least those we would force upon them, when it is more than probable, that we are no less obstinate in not embracing some of theirs. For where is the man that has uncontestable evidence of the truth of all that he holds, or of the falsehood of all he condemns ; or can say, that he has examined to the bottom, all his own, or other mens opinions ? The necessity of believing without knowledge, nay, often upon very slight grounds, in this fleeting state of action and

blindness we are in, should make us more busy and careful to inform ourselves, than constrain others. At least, those who have not thoroughly examined to the bottom all their own tenets, must confess they are unfit to prescribe to others; and are unreasonable in imposing that as truth on other mens belief, which they themselves have not searched into, nor weighed the arguments of probability, on which they should receive or reject it. Those who have fairly and truly examined, and are thereby got past doubt in all the doctrines they profess, and govern themselves by, would have a juster pretence to require others to follow them: But these are so few in number, and find so little reason to be magisterial in their opinions, that nothing insolent and imperious is to be expected from them: And there is reason to think, that if men were better instructed themselves, they would be less imposing on others.

§ 5. *Probability is either of Matter of Fact, or Speculation.*

BUT to return to the grounds of assent, and the several degrees of it: We are to take notice, that the propositions we receive upon inducements of *probability*, are of *two sorts*; either concerning some particular existence, or, as it is usually termed, *matter of fact*, which falling under observation, is capable of human testimony; or else concerning things, which being beyond the discovery of our senses, are not capable of any such testimony.

§ 6. *The concurrent Experience of all other Men with ours, produces Assurance approaching to Knowledge.*

CONCERNING the *first* of these, *viz. particular matter of fact.*

First, Where any particular thing, consonant to the constant observation of ourselves and others in the like case, comes attested by the concurrent reports of all that mention it, we receive it as easily, and build as firmly upon it, as if it were certain knowledge; and we reason and act thereupon with as little doubt, as if it were perfect demonstration. Thus, if all *Englishmen*, who have occasion to mention it, should affirm that it froze in

England the last winter, or that there were swallows seen there in the summer; I think a man could almost as little doubt of it; as that seven and four are eleven. The first therefore, and *highest degree of probability*, is, when the general consent of all men, in all ages, as far as it can be known, concurs with a man's constant and never-failing experience in like cases, to confirm the truth of any particular matter of fact attested by fair witnesses: such are all the stated constitutions and properties of bodies, and the regular proceedings of causes and effects in the ordinary course of nature. This we call an argument from the nature of things themselves. For what our own and other mens constant observation has found always to be after the same manner, that we with reason conclude to be the effects of steady and regular causes, though they come not within the reach of our knowledge. Thus, that fire warmed a man, made lead fluid, and changed the colour or consistency in wood or charcoal; that iron sunk in water, and swam in quicksilver: these, and the like propositions about particular facts, being agreeable to our constant experience, as often as we have to do with these matters; and being generally spoke of (when mentioned by others) as things found constantly to be so, and therefore not so much as controverted by any body; we are put past doubt, that a relation affirming any such thing to have been, or any predication that it will happen again in the same manner, is very true. These *probabilities* rise so near to *certainity*, that they govern our thoughts as absolutely, and influence all our actions as fully, as the most evident demonstration; and in what concerns us, we make little or no difference between them and certain knowledge. Our belief thus grounded, rises to *assurance*.

§ 7. *Unquestionable Testimony and Experience for the most part produce Confidence.*

SECONDLY, The next degree of probability is, when I find by my own experience, and the agreement of all others that mention it, a thing to be, for the most part so; and that the particular instance of it is attested by many and undoubted witnesses, v. g. history giving us such an ac-

count of men in all ages; and my own experience, as far as I had an opportunity to observe, confirming it, that most men prefer their private advantage to the public: if all historians that write of Tiberius, say that Tiberius did so, it is extremely probable. And in this case, our assent has a sufficient foundation to raise itself to a degree, which we may call *confidence*.

§ 8. *Fair Testimony and the nature of the thing indifferent, produces also confident Belief.*

THIRDLY, In things that happen indifferently, as that a bird should fly this or that way; that it should thunder on a man's right or left hand, &c. when any particular matter of fact is vouched by the concurrent testimony of unsuspected witnesses, there our assent is also unavoidable. Thus, that there is such a city in Italy as Rome; that about 1700 years ago, there lived in it a man called *Julius Caesar*; that he was a general, and that he won a battle against another called *Pompey*: this, though in the nature of the thing there be nothing for nor against it, yet being related by historians of credit, and contradicted by no one writer, a man cannot avoid believing it, and can as little doubt of it, as he does of the being and actions of his own acquaintance, whereof he himself is a witness.

§ 9. *Experiences and Testimonies clashing, infinitely vary the degrees of Probability.*

Thus far the matter goes easy enough. Probability upon such grounds carries so much evidence with it, that it naturally determines the judgment, and leaves us as little liberty to believe or disbelieve, as a demonstration does whether we will know, or be ignorant. The difficulty is, when testimonies contradict common experience, and the reports of history and witnesses clash with the ordinary course of nature, or with one another; there it is, where diligence, attention, and exactness is required, to form a right judgment, and to proportion the *assent* to the different evidence and probability of the thing; which rises and falls, according as those two foundations of credibility, *viz.* common observation in like cases, and particular testimonies in that particular instance, favour

or contradict it. These are liable to so great variety of contrary observations, circumstances, reports, different qualifications, tempers, designs, oversights, &c. of the reporters, that it is impossible to reduce to precise rules the various degrees wherein men give their assent. This only may be said in general, that as the arguments and proofs *pro* and *con*, upon due examination, nicely weighing every particular circumstance, shall to any one appear, upon the whole matter, in a greater or less degree, to preponderate on either side; so they are fitted to produce in the mind such different entertainment, as we call *belief*, *conjecture*, *guess*, *doubt*, *wavering*, *distrust*, *disbelief*, &c.

§ 10. *Traditional Testimonies, the farther removed, the less their Proof.*

THIS is what concerns *assent* in matters wherein testimony is made use of: concerning which, I think, it may not be amiss to take notice of a rule observed in the Law of *England*; which is, that though the attested copy of record be good proof, yet the copy of a copy never so well attested, and by never so credible witnesses, will not be admitted as a proof in judicature. This is so generally approved as reasonable, and suited to the wisdom and caution to be used in our inquiry after material truths, that I never yet heard of any one that blamed it. This practice, if it be allowable in the decisions of right and wrong, carries this observation along with it, *viz.* That any testimony, the farther off it is from the original truth, the less force and proof it has. The being and existence of the thing itself, is what I call the original truth. A credible man vouching his knowledge of it, is a good proof; but if another equally credible do witness it from his report, the testimony is weaker; and a third that attests the hearsay of an hearsay, is yet less considerable. So that *in traditional truths, each remove weakens the force of the proof*; and the more hands the tradition has successively passed through, the less strength and evidence does it receive from them. This I thought necessary to be taken notice of, because I find amongst some men the quite contrary commonly prac-

tised, who look on opinions to gain force by growing older: and what a thousand years since would not, to a rational man, contemporary with the first voucher, have appeared at all probable, is now urged as certain beyond all question, only because several have since, from him, said it one after another. Upon this ground, propositions evidently false or doubtful enough in their first beginning, come by an inverted rule of probability to pass for authentic truths; and those which found or deserved little credit from the mouths of their first authors are thought to grow venerable by age, and are urged as undeniable.

§ 11. *Yet History is of great use.*

I WOULD not be thought here to lessen the credit and use of *history*: it is all the light we have in many cases, and we receive from it a great part of the useful truths we have, with a convincing evidence. I think nothing more valuable than the records of antiquity: I wish we had more of them, and more uncorrupted. But this truth itself forces me to say, that no *probability* can arise higher than its first original. What has no other evidence than the single testimony of one only witness, must stand or fall by his only testimony, whether good, bad, or indifferent; and though cited afterwards by hundreds of others, one after another, is so far from receiving any strength thereby, that it is only the weaker. Passion, interest, inadvertency, mistake of his meaning, and a thousand odd reasons, or capricious mens minds are acted by (impossible to be discovered), may make one man quote another man's words or meaning wrong. He that has but ever so little examined the citations of writers, cannot doubt how little credit the quotations deserve, where the originals are wanting; and consequently how much less, quotations of quotations can be relied on. This is certain, that what in one age was affirmed upon slight grounds, can never after come to be more valid in future ages, by being often repeated. But the farther still it is from the original, the less valid it is, and has always less force in the mouth or writing of him that last made use of it, than in his from whom he received it.

§ 12. *In things which Sense cannot discover, Analogy is the great Rule of Probability.*

THE probabilities we have hitherto mentioned, are only such as concern matter of fact, and such things as are capable of observation and testimony. There remains that other sort, *concerning which men entertain opinions with variety of assent, though the things be such, that falling not under the reach of our senses, they are not capable of testimony.* Such are, 1. The existence, nature, and operations of finite immaterial beings without us; as spirits, angels, devils, &c. or the existence of material beings; which either for their smallness in themselves, or remoteness from us, our senses cannot take notice of, as whether there be any plants, animals, and intelligent inhabitants in the planets, and other mansions of the vast universe. 2. Concerning the manner of operation in most parts of the works of nature: wherein, though we see the sensible effects, yet their causes are unknown, and we perceive not the ways and manner how they are produced. We see animals are generated, nourished, and move; the loadstone draws iron; and the parts of a candle successively melting, turn into flame, and give us both light and heat. These and the like effects we see and know: but the causes that operate, and the manner they are produced in, we can only guess, and probably conjecture. For these and the like coming not within the scrutiny of human senses, cannot be examined by them, or be attested by any body; and therefore can appear more or less probable, only as they more or less agree to truths that are established in our minds, and as they hold proportion to other parts of our knowledge and observation. *Analogy* in these matters is the only help we have, and it is from that alone we draw all our grounds of probability. Thus observing that the bare rubbing of two bodies violently one upon another, produces heat, and very often fire itself, we have reason to think, that what we call heat and fire, consists in a violent agitation of the imperceptible minute parts of the burning matter: observing likewise that the different refractions of pellucid bodies produce in our eyes the dif-

ferent appearances of several colours; and also that the different ranging and laying the superficial parts of several bodies, as of velvet, watered silk, &c. does the like, we think it probable that the colour and shining of bodies, is in them nothing but the different arrangement and refraction of their minute and insensible parts. Thus finding in all parts of the creation, that fall under human observation, that there is a gradual connection of one with another, without any great or discernible gaps between, in all that great variety of things we see in the world, which are so closely linked together, that in the several ranks of beings, it is not easy to discover the bounds betwixt them; we have reason to be persuaded, that by such gentle steps things ascend upwards in degrees of perfection. It is a hard matter to say where insensible and rational begin, and where insensible and irrational end: and who is there quick-sighted enough to determine precisely, which is the lowest species of living things, and which the first of those which have no life? Things, as far as we can observe, lessen and augment, as the quantity does in a regular cone; where though there be a manifest odds betwixt the bigness of the diameter at a remote distance, yet the difference between the upper and under, where they touch one another, is hardly discernible. The difference is exceeding great between some men, and some animals: but if we will compare the understanding and abilities of some men and some brutes, we shall find so little difference, that it will be hard to say, that that of the man is either clearer or larger. Observing, I say, such gradual and gentle descents downwards in those parts of the creation that are beneath men, the rule of analogy may make it probable, that it is so also in things above us and our observation; and that there are several ranks of intelligent beings, excelling us in several degrees of perfection, ascending upwards towards the infinite perfection of the Creator, by gentle steps and differences, that are every one at no great distance from the next to it. This sort of probability, which is the best conduct of rational experiments, and the rise of hypotheses, has also its use and influence;

and a wary reasoning from analogy, leads us often into the discovery of truths and useful productions, which would otherwise lie concealed.

§ 13. *One Case where contrary Experience lessens not the Testimony.*

THOUGH the common experience and the ordinary course of things have justly a mighty influence on the minds of men, to make them give or refuse credit to any thing proposed to their belief; yet there is one case, wherein the strangeness of the fact lessens not the assent to a fair testimony given of it. For where such supernatural events are suitable to ends aimed at by him, who has the power to change the course of nature, there, under such circumstances, they may be the fitter to procure belief, by how much the more they are beyond, or contrary to ordinary observation. This is the proper case of *miracles*, which, well attested, do not only find credit themselves, but give it also to other truths, which need such confirmation.

§ 14. *The bare Testimony of Revelation is the highest Certainty.*

BESIDES those we have hitherto mentioned, there is one sort of propositions that challenge the highest degree of our assent upon bare testimony, whether the thing proposed agree or disagree with common experience, and the ordinary course of things, or no. The reason whereof is, because the testimony is of such an one, as cannot deceive, nor be deceived, and that is of GOD himself. This carries with it assurance beyond doubt, evidence beyond exception. This is called by a peculiar name, *revelation*; and our assent to it, *faith*: which as absolutely determines our minds, and as perfectly excludes all wavering, as our knowledge itself; and we may as well doubt of our own being, as we can, whether any revelation from GOD be true. So that faith is a settled and sure principle of assent and assurance, and leaves no manner of room for doubt or hesitation. Only we must be sure, that it be a divine revelation, and that we understand it right: else we shall expose ourselves to all the extravagancy of enthusiasm, and all the error of wrong principles, if we have faith and assurance in what is not

divine revelation. And therefore in those cases our assent can be rationally no higher than the evidence of its being a revelation, and that this is the meaning of the expressions it is delivered in. If the evidence of its being a revelation, or that this is its true sense be only on probable proofs, our assent can reach no higher than assurance or diffidence, arising from the more or less apparent probability of the proofs. But of faith, and the precedency it ought to have before other arguments of persuasion, I shall speak more hereafter, where I treat of it, as it is ordinarily placed, in contradistinction to reason; though in truth it be nothing else but an assent founded on the highest reason.

CHAP. XVII.

OF REASON.

§ 1. *Various Significations of the word Reason.*

THE word *reason*, in the *English* language, has *different significations*: sometimes it is taken for true and clear principles; sometimes for clear and fair deductions from those principles; and sometimes for the cause, and particularly the final cause. But the consideration I shall have of it here, is in a signification different from all these; and that is, as it stands for a faculty in man, that faculty whereby man is supposed to be distinguished from beasts, and wherein it is evident he much surpasses them.

§ 2. *Wherein Reasoning consists.*

IF general knowledge, as has been shown, consists in a perception of the agreement or disagreement of our own *ideas*; and the knowledge of the existence of all things without us (except only of a GOD, whose existence every man may certainly know and demonstrate to himself from his own existence) be had only by our senses: what room then is there for the exercise of any other faculty, but outward sense and inward perception? What need is there of reason? Very much; both for the enlargement of our knowledge, and regulating our assent: for it hath to do both in knowledge and opinion, and is

necessary and assisting to all our other intellectual faculties, and indeed contains two of them, *viz. sagacity and illation*. By the one, it finds out; and by the other, it so orders the intermediate *ideas*, as to discover what connection there is in each link of the chain, whereby the extremes are held together; and thereby, as it were, to draw into view the truth sought for, which is that we call *illation* or *inference*, and consists in nothing but the perception of the connection there is between the *ideas*, in each step of the deduction, whereby the mind comes to see either the certain agreement or disagreement of any two *ideas* as in demonstration, in which it arrives at knowledge; or their probable connection, on which it gives or withholds its assent, as in opinion. Sense and intuition reach but a very little way. The greatest part of our knowledge depends upon deductions and intermediate *ideas*: and in those cases, where we are fain to substitute assent instead of knowledge, and take propositions for true, without being certain they are so, we have need to find out, examine, and compare the grounds of their probability. In both these cases, the faculty which finds out the means, and rightly applies them to discover certainty in the one, and probability in the other, is that which we call reason. For as reason perceives the necessary and indubitable connection of all the *ideas* or proofs one to another, in each step of any demonstration that produces knowledge; so it likewise perceives the probable connection of all the *ideas* or proofs one to another, in every step of a discourse, to which it will think assent due. This is the lowest degree of that, which can be truly called reason. For where the mind does not perceive this probable connection, where it does not discern whether there be any such connection or no; there mens opinions are not the product of judgment, or the consequence of reason, but the effects of chance and hazard, of a mind floating at all adventures, without choice, and without direction.

§ 3. *Its four Parts.*

So that we may in *reason* consider these *four degrees*: the first and highest, is the discovering and finding out

of proofs; the second, the regular and methodical disposition of them, and laying them in a clear and fit order, to make their connection and force be plainly and easily perceived; the third is the perceiving their connection; and the fourth, a making a right conclusion. These several degrees may be observed in any mathematical demonstration; it being one thing to perceive the connection of each part, as the demonstration is made by another; another to perceive the dependence of the conclusion on all the parts; a third, to make out a demonstration clearly and neatly one's self; and something different from all these, to have first found out those intermediate *ideas* or proofs by which it is made.

§ 4. *Syllogism not the great Instrument of Reason.*

THERE is one thing more, which I shall desire to be considered concerning reason; and that is, whether *syllogism*, as is generally thought, be the proper instrument of it, and the usefulest way of exercising this faculty. The causes I have to doubt, are these:

First, Because syllogism serves our reason, but in one only of the fore-mentioned parts of it; and that is, to show the connection of the proofs in any one instance, and no more; but in this it is of no great use, since the mind can perceive such connection where it really is, as easily, nay perhaps better, without it.

If we will observe the actings of our own minds, we shall find that we reason best and clearest, when we only observe the connection of the proof, without reducing our thoughts to any rule of syllogism. And therefore we may take notice, that there are many men that reason exceeding clear and rightly, who know not how to make a syllogism. He that will look into many parts of *Asia* and *America*, will find men reason there perhaps as acutely as himself, who yet never heard of a syllogism, nor can reduce any one argument to those forms: And I believe scarce any one ever makes syllogisms in reasoning within himself. Indeed syllogism is made use of on occasion, to discover a fallacy hid in a rhetorical flourish, or cunningly wrapped up in a smooth period; and stripping an absurdity of the cover of wit

and good language, show it in its naked deformity. But the weakness or fallacy of such a loose discourse, it shows, by the artificial form it is put into, only to those who have thoroughly studied *mode* and *figure*, and have so examined the many ways that three propositions may be put together, as to know which of them does certainly conclude right, and which not, and upon what grounds it is that they do so. All who have so far considered *sylogism*, as to see the reason why in three propositions laid together in one form, the conclusion will be certainly right, but in another, not certainly so; I grant are certain of the conclusions they draw from the premises in the allowed *modes* and *figures*. But they who have not so far looked into those forms, are not sure by virtue of *sylogism*, that the conclusion certainly follows from the premises; they only take it to be so by an implicit faith in their teachers, and a confidence in those forms of argumentation; but this is still but believing, not being certain. Now if, of all mankind, those who can make *sylogisms* are extremely few in comparison of those who cannot; and if of those few who have been taught logic, there is but a very small number, who do any more than believe that *sylogisms* in the allowed *modes* and *figures* do conclude right, without knowing certainly that they do so; if *sylogisms* must be taken for the only proper instrument of reason and means of knowledge, it will follow, that before *Aristotle* there was not one man that did or could know any thing by reason; and that since the invention of *sylogisms*, there is not one of ten thousand that doth.

But God has not been so sparing to men to make them barely two-legged creatures, and left it to *Aristotle* to make them rational, *i. e.* those few of them that he could get so to examine the grounds of *sylogisms*, as to see, that in above threescore ways that three propositions may be laid together, there are but about fourteen, wherein one may be sure that the conclusion is right, and upon what ground it is, that in these few the conclusion is certain, and in the other not. God has been more bountiful to mankind than so. He has given them

a mind that can reason, without being instructed in methods of syllogising: The understanding is not taught to reason by these rules; it has a native faculty to perceive the coherence or incoherence of its ideas, and can range them right, without any such perplexing repetitions. I say not this any way to lessen Aristotle, whom I look on as one of the greatest men amongst the ancients; whose large views, acuteness and penetration of thought, and strength of judgment, few have equalled: And who in this very invention of forms of argumentation, wherein the conclusion may be shown to be rightly inferred, did great service against those who were not ashamed to deny any thing. And I readily own, that all right reasoning may be reduced to his forms of syllogism. But yet I think, without any diminution to him, I may truly say, that they are not the only, nor the best way of reasoning, for the leading of those into truth who are willing to find it, and desire to make the best use they may of their reason, for the attainment of knowledge. And he himself, it is plain, found out some forms to be conclusive, and others not, not by the forms themselves, but by the original way of knowledge, i. e. by the visible agreement of ideas. Tell a country gentlewoman that the wind is south-west, and the weather lowering, and like to rain, and she will easily understand, it is not safe for her to go abroad thin clad, in such a day, after a fever: she clearly sees the probable connection of all these, viz. south-west wind, and clouds, rain, wetting, taking cold, relapse, and danger of death, without tying them together in those artificial and cumbersome fetters of several syllogisms, that clog and hinder the mind, which proceeds from one part to another quicker and clearer without them; and the probability which she easily perceives in things thus in their native state would be quite lost, if this argument were managed learnedly, and proposed in mode and figure. For it very often confounds the connection: And, I think, every one will perceive in mathematical demonstra-

tions, that the knowledge gained thereby comes shortest and clearest without syllogisms.

Inference is looked on as the great act of the rational faculty, and so it is when it is rightly made: but the mind, either very desirous to enlarge its knowledge, or very apt to favour the sentiments it has once imbibed, is very forward to make inferences, and therefore often makes too much haste before it perceives the connection of the *ideas* that must hold the extremes together.

To infer, is nothing but by virtue of one proposition laid down as true, to draw in another as true, *i. e.* to see or suppose such a connection of the two *ideas* of the inferred proposition. *v. g.* Let this be the proposition laid down, *men shall be punished in another world*, and from thence be inferred this other, *then men can determine themselves*. The question now is to know whether the mind has made this inference right or no; if it has made it by finding out the intermediate *ideas*, and taking a view of the connection of them, placed in a due order, it has proceeded rationally, and made a right inference. If it has done it without such a view, it has not so much made an inference that will hold, or an inference of right reason, as showing a willingness to have it be, or be taken for such. But in neither case is it *syllogism* that discovered those *ideas*, or showed the connection of them, for they must be both found out, and the connection every where perceived, before they can rationally be made use of in *syllogism*: unless it can be said, that any *idea*, without considering what connection it hath with the two other, whose agreement should be shown by it, will do well enough in a *syllogism*, and may be taken at a venture for the *medius terminus*, to prove any conclusion. But this no body will say, because it is by virtue of the perceived agreement of the intermediate *idea* with the extremes, that the extremes are concluded to agree; and therefore each intermediate *idea* must be such, as in the whole chain hath a visible connection with those two it is placed between, or else there-

by the conclusion cannot be inferred or drawn in : for wherever any link of the chain is loose, and without connection, there the whole strength of it is lost, and it hath no force to infer or draw in any thing. In the instance above-mentioned, what is it shows the force of the inference, and consequently the reasonableness of it, but a view of the connection of all the intermediate *ideas* that draw in the conclusion, or proposition inferred? *v. g.* *Men shall be punished,—God the punisher,—just punishment,—the punished guilty,—could have done otherwise,—freedom,—self-determination* : By which chain of *ideas* thus visibly linked together in train, *i. e.* each intermediate *idea* agreeing on each side with those two it is immediately placed between, the *ideas* of men and self-determination appear to be connected, *i. e.* this proposition, *men can determine themselves* is drawn in, or inferred from this, *that they shall be punished in the other world*. For here mind seeing the connection there is between the *idea of mens punishment in the other world*, and the *idea of God punishing* ; between *justice of punishment* and *guilt* ; between *guilt* and a *power to do otherwise* ; between a *power to do otherwise* and *freedom*, and between *freedom* and *self-determination* ; sees the connection between *men* and *self-determination*.

Now I ask whether the connection of the extremes be not more clearly seen in this simple and natural disposition, than in the perplexed repetitions, and jumble of five or six *sylogisms*. I must beg pardon for calling it jumble, till somebody shall put these *ideas* into so many *sylogisms*, and then say, that they are less jumbled, and their connection more visible, when they are transposed and repeated, and spun out to a greater length in artificial forms ; than in that short natural plain order they are laid down in here, wherein every one may see it ; and wherein they must be seen before they can be put into a train of *sylogisms*. For the natural order of the connecting *ideas* must direct the order of the *sylogisms*, and a man must see the connection of each intermediate *idea* with those that it

connects, before he can with reason make use of it in a *sylogism*. And when all those *sylogisms* are made, neither those that are, nor those that are not logicians will see the force of the argumentation, *i. e.* the connection of the extremes, one jot the better. [For those that are not men of art, not knowing the true forms of *sylogism*, nor the reasons of them, cannot know whether they are made in right and conclusive *modes* and *figures* or no, and so are not at all helped by the forms they are put into; though by them the natural order, wherein the mind could judge of their respective connection, being disturbed, renders the illation much more uncertain than without them.] And as for logicians themselves, they see the connection of each intermediate *idea* with those it stands between (on which the force of the inference depends), as well before as after the *sylogism* is made, or else they do not see it at all. For a *sylogism* neither shows nor strengthens the connection of any two *ideas* immediately put together, but only by the connection seen in them, shows what connection the extremes have one with another. But what connection the intermediate has with either of the extremes in that *sylogism*, that no *sylogism* does or can show. That the mind only doth or can perceive, as they stand there in that *juxta-position* only by its own view, to which the *sylogistical* form it happens to be in gives no help or light all; it only shows, that if the intermediate *idea* agrees with those it is on both sides immediately applied to, then those two remote ones, or as they are called *extremes*, do certainly agree, and therefore the immediate connection of each *idea* to that which it is applied to on each side, on which the force of the reasoning depends, is as well seen before as after the *sylogism* is made, or else he that makes the *sylogism* could never see it at all. This, as has been already observed, is seen only by the eye, or the perceptive faculty of the mind, taking a view of them laid together in a *juxta-position*; which view of any two it has equally, whenever they are laid together in

any proposition, whether that proposition be placed as a *major*, or a *minor*, in a *syllogism* or no.

Of what use then are *syllogisms*? I answer, their chief and main use is in the schools, where men are allowed without shame to deny the agreement of *ideas* that do manifestly agree; or out of the schools to those who from thence have learned without shame to deny the connection of *ideas*, which even to themselves is visible. But to an ingenious searcher after truth, who has no other aim but to find it, there is no need of any such form to force the allowing of the inference: the truth and reasonableness of it is better seen in ranging of the *ideas* in a simple and plain order: And hence it is, that men, in their own inquiries after truth, never use *syllogisms* to convince themselves, [or in teaching others to instruct willing learners.] Because, before they can put them into a *syllogism*, they must see the connection that is between the intermediate *idea* and the two other *ideas* it is set between and applied to, to show their agreement; and when they see that, they see whether the inference be good or no, and so *syllogism* comes too late to settle it. For to make use again of the former instance, I ask whether the mind, considering the *idea* of justice, placed as an intermediate *idea* between the *punishment* of men, and the guilt of the punished (and, till it does so consider it, the mind cannot make use of it as a *medius terminus*), does not as plainly see the force and strength of the inference, as when it is formed into *syllogism*? To show it in a very plain and easy example; let *animal* be the intermediate *idea* or *medius terminus* that the mind makes use of to show the connection of *homo* and *vivens*: I ask whether the mind does not more readily and plainly see that connection in the simple and proper position of the connecting *idea* in the middle; thus,

Homo——*animal*——*vivens*,

than in this perplexed one,

Animal——*vivens*——*homo*——*animal*:

which is the position these *ideas* have in a syllogism, to show the connection between *homo* and *vivens* by the intervention of *animal*.

Indeed syllogism is thought to be of necessary use, even to the lovers of truth, to show them the fallacies that are often concealed in florid, witty or involved discourses. But that is a mistake, will appear, if we consider, that the reason why sometimes men who sincerely aim at truth, are imposed upon by such loose, and as they are called rhetorical discourses, is, that their fancies being struck with some lively metaphorical representations, they neglect to observe, or do not easily perceive what are the true *ideas*, upon which the inference depends. Now to show such men the weakness of such an argumentation, there needs no more but to strip it of the superfluous *ideas*, which blended and confounded with those on which the inference depends, seem to show a connection where there is none; or at least do hinder the discovery of the want of it; and then to lay the naked *ideas*, on which the force of the argumentation depends, in their due order, in which position the mind, taking a view of them, sees what connection they have, and so is able to judge of the inference, without any need of a syllogism at all.

I grant that *mode* and *figure* is commonly made use in such cases, as if the detection of the incoherence of such loose discourses were wholly owing to the syllogistical form; and so I myself formerly thought, till upon a stricter examination I now find, that laying the intermediate *ideas* naked in their due order, shows the incoherence of the argumentation better than syllogism; not only as subjecting each link of the chain, to the immediate view of the mind in its proper place, where, by its connection is best observed; but also because syllogism shows the incoherence only to those (who are not one of ten thousand) who perfectly understand *mode* and *figure*, and the reason upon which those forms are established: whereas a due and orderly placing of the *ideas*, upon which the inference is made,

makes every one, whether logician or not logician, who understands the terms, and hath the faculty to perceive the agreement or disagreement of such *ideas* (without which, in or out of syllogism, he cannot perceive the strength or weakness, coherence or incoherence of the discourse) see the want of connection in the argumentation, and the absurdity of the inference.

And thus I have known a man unskilful in syllogism, who at first hearing could perceive the weakness and inconclusiveness of a long artificial and plausible discourse, wherewith others better skilled in syllogism have been misled. And I believe there are few of my readers who do not know such. And indeed if it were not so, the debates of most princes councils, and the business of assemblies would be in danger to be mismanaged, since those who are relied upon, and have usually a great stroke in them, are not always such, who have the good luck to be perfectly knowing in the forms of *syllogism*, or expert in *mode* and *figure*. And if syllogism were the only, or so much as the surest way to detect the fallacies of artificial discourses; I do not think that all mankind, even princes in matters that concern their crowns and dignities, are so much in love with falsehood and mistake, that they would every where have neglected to bring syllogism into the debates of moment; or thought it ridiculous so much as to offer them in affairs of consequence: a plain evidence to me, that men of parts and penetration, who were not idly to dispute at their ease, but were to act according to the result of their debates, and often pay for their mistakes with their heads and fortunes, found those scholastic forms were of little use to discover truth or fallacy, whilst both the one and the other might be shown, and better shown without them, to those who would not refuse to see what was visibly shown them.

Secondly, Another reason that makes me doubt whether syllogism be the only proper instrument of reason in the discovery of truth, is, that of whatever

use *mode* and *figure* is pretended to be in the laying open of fallacy (which has been above considered), those scholastic forms of discourse are not less liable to fallacies than the plainer ways of argumentation: and for this I appeal to common observation, which has always found these artificial methods of reasoning more adapted to catch and entangle the mind, than to instruct and inform the understanding. And hence it is, that men even when they are baffled and silenced in this scholastic way, are seldom or never convinced, and so brought over to the conquering side: they perhaps acknowledge their adversary to be the more skilful disputant; but rest nevertheless persuaded of the truth on their side; and go away, worsted as they are, with the same opinion they brought with them: which they could not do, if this way of argumentation carried light and conviction with it, and made men see where the truth lay. And therefore syllogism has been thought more proper for the attaining victory in dispute, than for the discovery or confirmation of truth in fair inquiries. And if it be certain, that fallacy can be conched in syllogisms, as it cannot be denied, it must be something else, and not syllogism that must discover them.

I have had experience how ready some men are, when all the use which they have been wont to ascribe to any thing is not allowed, to cry out, that I am for laying it wholly aside. But to prevent such unjust and groundless imputations, I tell them, that I am not for taking away any helps to the understanding, in the attainment of knowledge. And if men skilled in, and used to syllogisms, find them assisting to their reason in the discovery of truth, I think they ought to make use of them. All that I aim at is, that they should not ascribe more to these forms than belongs to them; and think that men have no use, or not so full a use of their reasoning faculty without them. Some eyes want spectacles to see things clearly and distinctly; but let not those that use them therefore say, nobody can see clearly without them: those who do so will be

thought in favour with art (which perhaps they are beholden to) a little too much to depress and discredit nature. Reason, by its own penetration where it is strong and exercised, usually sees quicker and clearer without syllogism. If use of those spectacles has so dimmed its sight, that it cannot without them see consequences or inconsequences in argumentation, I am not so unreasonable as to be against the using them. Every one knows what best fits his own sight. But let him not thence conclude all in the dark, who use not just the same helps that he finds a need of.

§ 5. *Helps little in Demonstration, less in Probability.*

BUT however it be in knowledge, I think I may truly say, it is of *far less*, or *no use* at all in *probabilities*. For the assent there, being to be determined by the preponderancy, after a due weighing of all the proofs, with all circumstances on both sides, nothing is so unfit to assist the mind in that, as syllogism; which running away with one assumed probability, or one topical argument, pursues that, till it has led the mind quite out of sight of the thing under consideration; and forcing it upon some remote difficulty, holds it fast there, entangled, perhaps, and as it were manacled in the chain of syllogisms, without allowing it the liberty, much less affording it the helps requisite to show on which side, all things considered, is the greater probability.

§ 6. *Serves not to increase our Knowledge, but fence with it.*

BUT let it help us (as perhaps may be said) in convincing men of their errors and mistakes: (and yet I would fain see the man that was forced out of his opinion by dint of *syllogism*) yet still it fails our *reason* in that part, which, if not its highest perfection, is yet certainly its hardest task, and that which we most need its help in; and that is *the finding out of proofs, and making new discoveries*. The rules of *syllogism* serve not to furnish the mind with those intermediate ideas that may show the connection of remote

ones. This way of reasoning discovers no new proofs, but is the art of marshalling and ranging the old ones we have already. The 47th proposition of the first book of Euclid is very true; but the discovery of it, I think, not owing to any rules of common logic. A man knows first, and then he is able to prove syllogistically. So that *syllogism* comes after knowledge, and then a man has little or no need of it. But it is chiefly by the finding out those *ideas* that show the connection of distant ones, that our stock of knowledge is increased, and that useful arts and sciences are advanced. *Syllogism* at best is but the art of fencing with the little knowledge we have, without making any addition to it. And if a man should employ his reason all this way, he will not do much otherwise than he, who having got some iron out of the bowels of the earth, should have it beaten up all into swords, and put it into his servants hands to fence with, and bang one another. Had the king of Spain employed the hands of his people, and his Spanish iron so, he had brought to light but little of that treasure that lay so long hid in the dark entrails of America. And I am apt to think, that he who shall employ all the force of his reason only in brandishing of *syllogisms*, will discover very little of that mass of knowledge, which lies yet concealed in the secret recesses of nature; and which I am apt to think, native rustic reason (as it formerly has done) is likelier to open a way to, and add to the common stock of mankind, rather than any scholastic proceeding by the strict rules of mode and figure.

§ 7. *Other Helps should be sought.*

I DOUBT not nevertheless, but there are ways to be found to assist our reason in this most useful part; and this the judicious *Hooker* encourages me to say, who in his *Eccl. Pol. l. 1. §. 6.* speaks thus: *If there might be added the right helps of true art and learning (which helps I must plainly confess, this age of the world carrying the name of a learned age, doth neither much know, nor generally regard), there would un-*

doubtedly be almost as much difference in maturity of judgment between men therewith inured, and that which now men are, as between men that are now, and innocents. I do not pretend to have found, or discovered here any of those *right helps of art*, this great man of deep thought mentions; but this is plain, that *syllogism*, and the logic now in use, which were as well known in his days, can be none of those he means. It is sufficient for me, if by a discourse, perhaps something out of the way, I am sure as to me wholly new and unborrowed, I shall have given an occasion to others, to cast about for new discoveries, and to seek in their own thoughts, for those *right helps of art*, which will scarce be found, I fear, by those who servilely confine themselves to the rules and dictates of others. For beaten tracts lead these sort of cattle (as an observing *Roman* calls them), whose thoughts reach only to imitation, *non quo eundum est, sed quo itur*. But I can be bold to say, that this age is adorned with some men of that strength of judgment, and largeness of comprehension, that if they would employ their thoughts on this subject, could open new and undiscovered ways to the advancement of knowledge.

§ 8. *We reason about Particulars.*

HAVING here had an occasion to speak of *syllogism* in general, and the use of it in reasoning, and the improvement of our knowledge; it is fit, before I leave this subject, to take notice of one manifest mistake in the rules of *syllogism*, viz. that no syllogistical reasoning can be right and conclusive, but what has, at least, one general proposition in it. As if we could not reason, and have knowledge about particulars: whereas in truth, the matter rightly considered, the immediate object of all our reasoning and knowledge, is nothing but particulars. Every man's reasoning and knowledge is only about the *ideas* existing in his own mind, which are truly, every one of them, particular existences; and our knowledge and reasoning about other things, is only as they correspond with those our particular *ideas*. So that the perception of the agree-

ment or disagreement of our particular *ideas*, is the whole and utmost of all our knowledge. Universality is but accidental to it, and consists only in this, that the particular *ideas* about which it is, are such, as more than one particular thing can correspond with, and be represented by. But the perception of the agreement or disagreement of any two *ideas*, and consequently our knowledge, is equally clear and certain, whether either, or both, or neither of those *ideas* be capable of representing more real beings than one, or no. One thing more I crave leave to offer about syllogism, before I leave it, *viz.* May one not upon just ground inquire whether the form syllogism now has, is that which in reason it ought to have? For the *medius terminus* being to join the extremes, *i. e.* the intermediate *ideas* by its intervention, to show the agreement or disagreement of the two in question, would not the position of the *medius terminus* be more natural, and show the agreement or disagreement of the extremes clearer and better, if it were placed in the middle between them? Which might be easily done by transposing the propositions, and making the *medius terminus* the predicate of the first, and the subject of the second. As thus,

Omnis homo est animal,
Omne animal est vivens,
Ergo omnis homo est vivens.

Omne corpus est extensum & solidum,
Nullum extensum & solidum est pura extensio,
Ergo corpus non est pura extensio.

I need not trouble my reader with instances in *syllogisms*, whose conclusions are particular. The same reason holds for the same form in them, as well as in the general.

§ 9. 1. *Reason fails us for want of Ideas.*

REASON, though it penetrates into the depths of the sea and earth, elevates our thoughts as high as the

stars, and leads us through the vast spaces and large rooms of this mighty fabric, yet it comes far short of the real extent of even corporeal being; and there are many instances wherein it *fails us*: as,

First, it perfectly fails us, *where our ideas fail*. It neither does, nor can extend itself farther than they do. And therefore, wherever we have no *ideas*, our reasoning stops, and we are at an end of our reckoning: and if at any time we reason about words, which do not stand for any *ideas*, it is only about those sounds, and nothing else.

§ 10. 2. *Because of obscure and imperfect Ideas.*

SECONDLY, Our reason is often puzzled, and at a loss, *because of the obscurity, confusion or imperfection of the ideas it is employed about*; and there we are involved in difficulties and contradictions. Thus not having any perfect *idea* of the least extension of matter, nor of infinity, we are at a loss about the divisibility of matter; but having perfect, clear and distinct *ideas* of number, our reason meets with none of those inextricable difficulties in numbers, nor finds itself involved in any contradictions about them. Thus, we having but imperfect *ideas* of the operations of our minds, and of the beginning of motion or thought, how the mind produces either of them in us, and much imperfecter yet, of the operation of God, run into great difficulties about the free created agents, which reason cannot well extricate itself out of.

§ 11. 3. *For want of intermediate Ideas.*

THIRDLY, Our reason is often at a stand, *because it perceives not those ideas, which could serve to show the certain or probable agreement or disagreement of any two other Ideas*: and in this, some mens faculties far outgo others. Till *algebra*, that great instrument and instance of human sagacity, was discovered, men, with amazement, looked on several of the demonstrations of ancient mathematicians, and could scarce forbear to think the finding several of those proofs to be something more than human.

§ 12. 4. *Because of wrong Principles.*

FOURTHLY, The mind, *by proceeding upon false principles*, is often engaged in absurdities and difficulties, brought into straits and contradictions, without knowing how to free itself: and in that case it is in vain to implore the help of reason, unless it be to discover the falsehood, and reject the influence of those wrong principles. Reason is so far from clearing the difficulties which the building upon false foundations brings a man into, that if he will pursue it, it entangles him the more, and engages him deeper in perplexities.

§ 13. 5. *Because of doubtful Terms.*

FIFTHLY, As obscure and imperfect *ideas* often involve our reason, so upon the same ground, do *dubious words*, and uncertain signs, *often* in discourses and arguings, when not warily attended to, *puzzle mens reason*, and bring them to a *non-plus*. But these two latter are our fault, and not the fault of reason. But yet the consequences of them are nevertheless obvious: and the perplexities or errors they fill mens minds with, are every where observable.

§ 14. *Our highest Degree of Knowledge is intuitive, without Reasoning.*

SOME of the *ideas* that are in the mind, are so there, that they can be by themselves immediately compared one with another: and in these the mind is able to perceive, that they agree or disagree as clearly, as that it has them. Thus the mind perceives, that an arch of a circle is less than the whole circle, as clearly as it does the *idea* of a circle: and this therefore, as has been said, I call *intuitive knowledge*; which is certain, beyond all doubt, and needs no probation, nor can have any; this being the highest of all human certainty. In this consists the evidence of all those *maxims*, which nobody has any doubt about, but every man (does not, as is said, only assent to, but) knows to be true, as soon as ever they are proposed to his understanding. In the discovery of, and assent to these truths, there is no use of the discursive faculty, *no need of reasoning*, but they are known by a supe-

rior and higher degree of *evidence*. And such, if I may guess at things unknown, I am apt to think, that angels have now, and the spirits of just men made perfect shall have, in a future state, of thousands of things, which now either wholly escape our apprehensions, or which, our short-sighted reason having got some faint glimpse of, we, in the dark, grope after.

§ 15. *The next is Demonstration by Reasoning.*

BUT though we have, here and there, a little of this clear light, some sparks of bright knowledge; yet the greatest part of our *ideas* are such, that we cannot discern their agreement or disagreement by an immediate comparing them. And in all these we have *need of reasoning*, and must, by discourse and inference, make our discoveries. Now of these there are two sorts, which I shall take the liberty to mention here again.

First, Those whose agreement or disagreement, though it cannot be seen by an immediate putting them together, yet may be examined by the intervention of other *ideas*, which can be compared with them. In this case when the agreement or disagreement of the intermediate *idea* on both sides, with those which we would compare, is plainly discerned, there it amounts to demonstration, whereby knowledge is produced; which though it be certain, yet it is not so easy, nor altogether so clear as *intuitive knowledge*. Because in that there is barely one simple intuition, wherein there is no room for any the least mistake or doubt; the truth is seen all perfectly at once. In demonstration, it is true, there is intuition too, but not altogether at once; for there must be a remembrance of the intuition of the agreement of the *medium*, or intermediate *idea*, with that we compared it with before, when we compare it with the other; and where there be many *mediums*, there the danger of the mistake is the greater. For each agreement or disagreement of the *ideas* must be observed and seen in each step of the whole train, and retained in the memory, just as it is; and the mind must be sure that no part of

what is necessary to make up the demonstration is omitted or overlooked. This makes some demonstrations long and perplexed, and too hard for those who have not strength of parts distinctly to perceive, and exactly carry so many particulars orderly in their heads. And even those, who are able to master such intricate speculations, are fain sometimes to go over them again, and there is need of more than one review before they can arrive at certainty. But yet where the mind clearly retains the intuition it had of the agreement of any *idea* with another, and that with a third, and that with a fourth, &c. there the agreement of the first and the fourth is a demonstration, and produces certain knowledge, which may be called *rational knowledge*, as the other is *intuitive*.

§ 16. *To supply the Narrowness of this, we have nothing but Judgment upon probable reasoning.*

SECONDLY, there are other *ideas*, whose agreement or disagreement can no otherwise be judged of, but by the intervention of others, which have not a certain agreement with the extremes, but an usual or likely one: and in these it is that the *judgment* is properly exercised, which is the acquiescing of the mind, that any *ideas* do agree, by comparing them with such probable *mediums*. This, though it never amounts to knowledge, no not to that which is the lowest degree of it; yet sometimes the intermediate *ideas* tie the extremes so firmly together, and the probability is so clear and strong, that assent as necessarily follows it, as knowledge does demonstration. The great excellency and use of the judgment is to observe right, and take a true estimate of the force and weight of each probability; and then casting them up all right together, choose that side which has the overbalance.

§ 17. *Intuition, Demonstration, Judgment.*

INTUITIVE knowledge is the perception of the certain agreement or disagreement of two *ideas* immediately compared together.

Rational knowledge is the perception of the certain agreement or disagreement of any two *ideas*, by the intervention of one or more other *ideas*.

Judgment is the thinking or taking two *ideas* to agree or disagree, by the intervention of one or more *ideas*, whose certain agreement or disagreement with them it does not perceive, but hath observed to be frequent and usual.

§ 18. *Consequences of Words, and Consequences of Ideas.*

THOUGH the deducing one proposition from another, or making *inferences in words*, be a great part of reason, and that which it is usually employed about; yet the principal act of ratiocination is the finding the agreement or disagreement of two *ideas* one with another, by the intervention of a third. As a man, by a yard, finds two houses to be of the same length, which could not be brought together to measure their equality by *juxta-position*. Words have their consequences, as the signs of such *ideas*; and things agree or disagree, as really they are; but we observe it only by our *ideas*.

§ 19. *Four Sorts of Arguments.*

BEFORE we quit this subject, it may be worth our while a little to reflect on *four sorts of arguments*, that men, in their reasonings with others, do ordinarily make use of, to prevail on their assent; or at least so to awe them, as to silence their opposition.

1. *Ad Verecundiam.*

First, the first is, to alledge the opinions of men, whose parts, learning, eminency, power, or some other cause has gained a name, and settled their reputation in the common esteem with some kind of authority. When men are established in any kind of dignity, it is thought a breach of modesty for others to derogate any way from it, and question the authority of men who are in possession of it. This is apt to be censured, as carrying with it too much of pride, when a man does not readily yield to the determination of approved authors, which is wont to be re-

ceived with respect and submission by others ; and it is looked upon as insolence for a man to set up, and adhere to his own opinion, against the current stream of antiquity ; or to put it in the balance against that of some learned doctor, or otherwise approved writer. Whoever backs his tenets with such authorities, thinks he ought thereby to carry the cause, and is ready to style it impudence in any one who shall stand out against them. This, I think, may be called *argumentum ad verecundiam*.

§ 20. 2. Ad Ignorantiam.

SECONDLY, Another way that men ordinarily use to drive others, and force them to submit their judgments, and receive the opinion in debate, is to require the adversary to admit what they allege as a proof, or to assign a better. And this I call *argumentum ad ignorantiam*.

§ 21. 3. Ad Hominem.

THIRDLY, a third way is to press a man with consequences drawn from his own principles, or concessions. This is already known under the name of *argumentum ad hominem*.

§ 22. 4. Ad Judicium.

FOURTHLY, the fourth is, the using of proofs drawn from any of the foundations of knowledge or probability. This I call *argumentum ad judicium*. This alone of all the four, brings true instruction with it, and advances us in our way to knowledge. For, 1. It argues not another man's opinion to be right, because I out of respect, or any other consideration but that of conviction, will not contradict him. 2. It proves not another man to be in the right way, nor that I ought to take the same with him, because I know not a better. 3. Nor does it follow that another man is in the right way, because he has shown me that I am in the wrong. I may be modest, and therefore not oppose another man's persuasion : I may be ignorant, and not be able to produce a better ; I may be in an error, and another may show me that I am so. This may dispose me, perhaps, for the reception of truth,

but helps me not to it; that must come from proofs and arguments, and light arising from the nature of things themselves, and not from my shamefacedness, ignorance or error.

§ 23. *Above, contrary, and according to Reason.*

By what has been before said of *reason*, we may be able to make some guess at the distinction of things, into those that are according to, above, and contrary to reason. 1. *According to reason* are such propositions, whose truth we can discover, by examining and tracing those *ideas* we have from *sensation* and *reflection*; and by natural deduction find to be true or probable. 2. *Above reason* are such propositions, whose truth or probability we cannot by reason derive from those principles. 3. *Contrary to reason* are such propositions, as are inconsistent with, or irreconcilable to our clear and distinct *ideas*. Thus the existence of one God is according to reason; the existence of more than one God, contrary to reason; the resurrection of the dead, above reason. Farther, as *above reason* may be taken in a double sense, *viz.* either as signifying above probability, or above certainty; so in that large sense also, *contrary to reason*, is, I suppose, sometimes taken.

§ 24. *Reason and Faith not opposite.*

THERE is another use of the word *reason*, wherein it is *opposed to faith*: which though it be in itself a very improper way of speaking, yet common use has so authorised it, that it would be folly either to oppose or hope to remedy it: only I think it may not be amiss to take notice, that however *faith* be opposed to reason, *faith* is nothing but a firm assent of the mind: which if it be regulated, as is our duty, cannot be afforded to any thing but upon good reason; and so cannot be opposite to it. He that believes, without having any reason for believing, may be in love with his own fancies; but neither seeks truth as he ought, nor pays the obedience due to his Maker, who would have him use those discerning faculties he has given him, to keep him out of mistake and error. He that does

not this to the best of his power, however he sometimes lights on truth, is in the right but by chance; and I know not whether the luckiness of the accident will excuse the irregularity of his proceeding. This at least is certain, that he must be accountable for whatever mistakes he runs into: whereas he that makes use of the light and faculties God has given him, and seeks sincerely to discover truth by those helps and abilities he has, may have this satisfaction in doing his duty as a rational creature, that though he should miss truth, he will not miss the reward of it. For he governs his assent right, and places it as he should, who in any case or matter whatsoever, believes or disbelieves according as reason directs him. He that does otherwise, transgresses against his own light, and misuses those faculties which were given him to no other end but to search and follow the clearer evidence, and greater probability. But since reason and faith are by some men opposed, we will so consider them in the following chapter.

CHAP. XVIII.

OF FAITH AND REASON, AND THEIR DISTINCT PROVINCES.

§ 1. *Necessary to know their boundaries.*

IT has been above shown, 1. That we are of necessity ignorant, and want knowledge of all sorts, where we want *ideas*. 2. That we are ignorant, and want rational knowledge, where we want proofs. 3. That we want general knowledge and certainty, as far as we want clear and determined specific *ideas*. 4. That we want probability to direct our assent in matters where we have neither knowledge of our own, nor testimony of other men, to bottom our reason upon.

From these things thus premised, I think we may come to lay down the measures and *boundaries between faith and reason*; the want whereof may possibly have

been the cause, if not of great disorders, yet at least of great disputes, and perhaps mistakes in the world. For till it be resolved how far we are to be guided by reason, and how far by faith, we shall in vain dispute, and endeavour to convince one another in matters of religion.

§ 2. *Faith and Reason what, as contradistinguished.* I FIND every sect, as far as reason will help them, make use of it gladly: and where it fails them, they cry out, *It is matter of faith, and above reason.* And I do not see how they can argue with any one, or ever convince a gainsayer who makes use of the same plea, without setting down strict boundaries between *faith* and *reason*; which ought to be the first point established in all questions, where *faith* has any thing to do.

Reason, therefore here, as contradistinguished to *faith*, I take to be the discovery of the certainty or probability of such propositions or truths, which the mind arrives at by deduction made from such *ideas*, which it has got by the use of its natural faculties, viz. by sensation or reflection.

Faith, on the other side, is the assent to any proposition, not thus made out by the deductions of reason; but upon the credit of the proposer, as coming from God, in some extraordinary way of communication. This way of discovering truths to men we call *Revelation*.

§ 3. *No new simple Idea can be conveyed by traditional Revelation.*

FIRST then I say, that *no man inspired by God, can by any revelation communicate to others any new simple ideas*, which they had not before from sensation or reflection. For whatsoever impressions he himself may have from the immediate hand of God, this revelation, if it be of new simple *ideas*, cannot be conveyed to another, either by words, or any other signs. Because words by their immediate operation on us, cause no other *ideas*, but of their natural sounds: and it is by the custom of using them for signs, that they excite and

revive in our minds latent *ideas* ; but yet only such *ideas* as were there before. For words seen or heard, recal to our thoughts those *ideas* only, which to us they have been wont to be signs of ; but cannot introduce any perfectly new, and formerly unknown simple *ideas*. The same holds in all other signs, which cannot signify to us things, of which we have before never had any *idea* at all.

Thus whatever things were discovered to St. Paul when he was wrapped up into the third heaven, whatever new *ideas* his mind there received, all the description he can make to others of that place, is only this, that there are such things, *as eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive*. And supposing God should discover to any one, supernaturally, a species of creatures inhabiting, for example, *Jupiter*, or *Saturn*, (for that it is possible there may be such, nobody can deny) which had six senses ; and imprint on his mind the *ideas* conveyed to theirs by that sixth sense ; he could no more by words, produce in the minds of other men those *ideas*, imprinted by that sixth sense, than one of us could convey the *idea* of any colour by the sounds of words into a man, who having the other four senses perfect, had always totally wanted the fifth of seeing. For our simple *ideas* then, which are the foundation and sole matter of all our notions and knowledge, we must depend wholly on our reason, I mean our natural faculties ; and can by no means receive them, or any of them, from *traditional revelation* ; I say, *traditional revelation*, in distinction to *original revelation*. By the one, I mean that first impression, which is made immediately by God, on the mind of any man, to which we cannot set any bounds ; and by the other, those impressions delivered over to others in words, and the ordinary ways of conveying our conceptions one to another.

§ 4. *Traditional Revelation may make us know propositions knowable also by Reason, but not with the same Certainty that Reason doth.*

SECONDLY, I say, that *the same truths may be discovered, and conveyed down from revelation, which are discoverable to us by reason, and by those ideas we naturally may have.* So God might, by revelation, discover the truth of any proposition in Euclid; as well as men, by the natural use of their faculties, come to make the discovery themselves. In all things of this kind, there is little need or use of *revelation*, God having furnished us with natural and surer means to arrive at the knowledge of them. For whatsoever truth we come to the clear discovery of, from the knowledge and contemplation of our own *ideas*, will always be certainer to us, than those which are conveyed to us by *traditional revelation*. For the knowledge we have, that this *revelation* came at first from God, can never be so sure, as the knowledge we have from the clear and distinct perception of the agreement or disagreement of our own *ideas*, *v. g.* if it were revealed some ages since, that the three angles of a triangle were equal to two right ones, I might assent to the truth of that proposition, upon the credit of the tradition, that it was revealed: But that would never amount to so great a certainty, as the knowledge of it, upon the comparing and measuring my own *ideas* of two right angles, and the three angles of a triangle. The like holds in matter of fact, knowable by our senses, *v. g.* the history of the deluge is conveyed to us by writings, which had their original from revelation: and yet nobody, I think, will say he has as certain and clear a knowledge of the flood, as Noah that saw it; or that he himself would have had, had he then been alive, and seen it. For he has no greater an assurance than that of his senses, that it is writ in the book supposed writ by Moses inspired: But he has not so great an assurance that Moses writ that book, as if he had seen Moses write

it. So that the assurance of its being a revelation, is less still than the assurance of his senses.

§ 5. *Revelation cannot be admitted against the clear Evidence of Reason.*

IN propositions then, whose certainty is built upon the clear perception of the agreement or disagreement of our *ideas*, attained either by immediate intuition, as in self-evident propositions, or by evident deductions of reason in demonstrations, we need not the assistance of *revelation*, as necessary to gain our assent, and introduce them into our minds. Because the natural ways of knowledge could settle them there, or had done it already; which is the greatest assurance we can possibly have of any thing, unless where God immediately reveals it to us: And there too our assurance can be no greater, than our knowledge is, that it is a *revelation* from God. But yet nothing, I think, can under that title, shake or over-rule plain knowledge; or rationally prevail with any man to admit it for true, in a direct contradiction to the clear evidence of his own understanding. For since no evidence of our faculties, by which we receive such *revelations*, can exceed, if equal, the certainty of our intuitive knowledge, we can never receive for a truth any thing, that is directly contrary to our clear and distinct knowledge; *v. g.* the *ideas* of one body, and one place, do so clearly agree, and the mind has so evident a perception of their agreement, that we can never assent to a proposition, that affirms the same body to be in two distant places at once, however it should pretend to the authority of a divine *revelation*: Since the evidence, *first*, that we deceive not ourselves, in ascribing it to God; *secondly*, that we understand it right; can never be so great, as the evidence of our own intuitive knowledge, whereby we discern it impossible for the same body to be in two places at once. And therefore no proposition can be received for divine revelation, or obtain the assent due to all such, if it be contradictory to our clear intuitive knowledge. Because this would be to subvert the principles and

foundations of all knowledge, evidence and assent whatsoever: and there would be left no difference between truth and falsehood, no measures of credible and incredible in the world, if doubtful propositions shall take place before self-evident; and what we certainly know, give way to what we may possibly be mistaken in. In propositions, therefore, contrary to the clear perception of the agreement or disagreement of any of our *ideas*, it will be in vain to urge them as matters of *faith*. They cannot move our assent, under that or any other title whatsoever. For *faith* can never convince us of any thing, that contradicts our knowledge. Because though *faith* be founded on the testimony of GOD (who cannot lie) revealing any proposition to us; yet we cannot have an assurance of the truth of its being a divine revelation, greater than our own knowledge: since the whole strength of the certainty depends upon our knowledge that GOD revealed it, which in this case, where the proposition supposed revealed contradicts our knowledge or reason, will always have this objection hanging to it, *viz.* that we cannot tell how to conceive that to come from GOD, the bountiful Author of our being, which if received for true, must overturn all the principles and foundations of knowledge he has given us, render all our faculties useless, wholly destroy the most excellent part of his workmanship, our understandings; and put a man in a condition, wherein he will have less light, less conduct than the beast that perisheth. For if the mind of man can never have a clearer (and perhaps not so clear) evidence of any thing to be a divine *revelation*, as it has of the principles of its own reason, it can never have a ground to quit the clear evidence of its reason, to give place to a proposition, whose *revelation* has not a greater evidence than those principles have.

§ 6. *Traditional Revelation much less.*

THUS far a man has use of reason, and ought to hearken to it, even in immediate and original *revelation*, where it is supposed to be made to himself: but to all those who pretend not to immediate *revelation*, but are required to pay obedience, and to receive the truths revealed to

others, which by the tradition of writings, or word of mouth, are conveyed down to them; reason has a great deal more to do, and is that only which can induce us to receive them. For matter of faith being only divine revelation, and nothing else; *faith*, as we use the word, (called commonly *divine faith*) has to do with no propositions, but those which are supposed to be divinely revealed. So that I do not see how those, who make revelation alone the sole object of *faith*, can say that it is a matter of *faith*, and not of *reason*, to believe that such or such a proposition, to be found in such or such a book, is of divine inspiration; unless it be revealed, that that proposition, or all in that book, was communicated by divine inspiration. With such a *revelation*, the believing, or not believing that proposition or book to be of divine authority, can never be matter of *faith*, but matter of *reason*: and such as I must come to an assent to, only by the use of my reason, which can never require or enable me to believe that, which is contrary to itself: it being impossible for reason ever to procure any assent to that, which to itself appears unreasonable.

In all things, therefore, where we have clear evidence from our *ideas*, and those principles of knowledge I have above mentioned, *reason* is the proper judge; and *revelation*, though it may in consenting with it confirm its dictates, yet cannot in such cases invalidate its decrees: *Nor can we be obliged, where we have the clear and evident sentence of reason, to quit it for the contrary opinion, under a pretence that it is matter of faith; which can have no authority against the plain and clear dictates of reason.*

§ 7. *Things above reason.*

BUT, *thirdly*, there being many things, wherein we have very imperfect notions, or none at all; and other things, of whose past, present, or future existence, by the natural use of our faculties we can have no knowledge at all: These, as being beyond the discovery of our natural faculties, and above *reason*, are, when revealed, *the proper matter of faith*. Thus, the part of the angels rebelled against GOD, and thereby lost their first happy

state; and that the dead shall rise, and live again: these, and the like, being beyond the discovery of *reason*, are purely matters of *faith*; with which *reason* has directly nothing to do.

§ 8. *Or not contrary to Reason, if revealed, are matter of Faith.*

BUT since GOD in giving us the light of *reason* has not thereby tied up his own hands from affording us, when he thinks fit, the light of *revelation* in any of those matters, wherein our natural faculties are able to give a probable determination; *revelation*, where God has been pleased to give it, *must carry it, against the probable conjectures of reason*. Because the mind not being certain of the truth of that it does not evidently know, but only yielding to the probability that appears in it, is bound to give up its assent to such a testimony; which, it is satisfied, comes from one who cannot err, and will not deceive. But yet it still belongs to *reason* to judge of the truth of its being a revelation, and of the signification of the words wherein it is delivered. Indeed, if any thing shall be thought *revelation*, which is contrary to the plain principles of reason, and the evident knowledge the mind has of its own clear and distinct *ideas*; there *reason* must be hearkened to, as to a matter within its province: since a man can never have so certain a knowledge, that a proposition which contradicts the clear principles and evidence of his own knowledge was divinely revealed, or that he understands the words rightly wherein it is delivered; as he has, that the contrary is true: and so is bound to consider and judge of it as a matter of *reason*, and not swallow it, without examination, as a matter of *faith*.

§ 9. *Revelation in Matters where Reason cannot judge, or but probably, ought to be hearkened to.*

FIRST, Whatever proposition is revealed, of whose truth our mind, by its natural faculties and notions, cannot judge; that is purely *matter of faith*, and above reason.

Secondly, All propositions, whereof the mind, by the use of its natural faculties, can come to determine and

judge from naturally acquired *ideas*, are *matter of reason*: with this difference still, that in those concerning which it has but an uncertain evidence, and so is persuaded of their truth only upon probable grounds, which still admit a possibility of the contrary to be true, without doing violence to the certain evidence of its own knowledge, and overturning the principles of all reason; in such probable propositions, I say, an evident *revelation* ought to determine our assent even against probability. For where the principles of reason have not evidenced a proposition to be certainly true or false, there clear *revelation*, as another principle of truth, and ground of assent, may determine; and so it may be *matter of faith*, and be also above *reason*. Because *reason*, in that particular matter, being able to reach no higher than probability, *faith* gave the determination, where *reason* came short; and *revelation* discovered on which side the truth lay.

§ 10. *In Matters where Reason can afford certain Knowledge that is to be hearkened to.*

THUS far the dominion of *faith* reaches, and that without any violence or hindrance to *reason*; which is not injured or disturbed, but assisted and improved, by new discoveries of truth, coming from the eternal fountain of all knowledge. Whatever GOD hath revealed, is certainly true; no doubt can be made of it. This is the proper object of *faith*: But whether it be a divine revelation or no, *reason* must judge; which can never permit the mind to reject a greater evidence, to embrace what is less evident, nor allow it to entertain probability in opposition to knowledge and certainty. There can be no evidence, that any traditional revelation is of divine original, in the words we receive it, and in the sense we understand it, so clear and so certain, as that of the principles of reason; and therefore, *nothing that is contrary to and inconsistent with the clear and self-evident dictates of reason, has a right to be urged or assented to as a matter of faith, wherein reason hath nothing to do.* Whatsoever is divine revelation, ought to over-rule all our opinions, prejudices, and interests, and hath a right to be received

with full assent. Such a submission as this, of our *reason* to *faith*, takes not away the land-marks of knowledge: This shakes not the foundations of reason, but leaves us that use of our faculties, for which they were given us.

§ 11. *If the boundaries be not set between Faith and Reason, no Enthusiasm or Extravagancy in Religion can be contradicted.*

If the provinces of faith and reason are not kept distinct by these boundaries, there will, in matter of religion, be no room for reason at all; and those extravagant opinions and ceremonies that are to be found in the several religions of the world, will not deserve to be blamed. For, to this crying up of faith, in opposition to reason, we may, I think, in good measure ascribe those absurdities that fill almost all the religions which possess and divide mankind. For men having been principled with an opinion, that they must not consult reason in the things of religion, however apparently contradictory to common sense, and the very principles of all their knowledge, have let loose their fancies and natural superstition; and have been by them led into so strange opinions and extravagant practices in religion, that a considerate man cannot but stand amazed at their follies, and judge them so far from being acceptable to the great and wise GOD, that he cannot avoid thinking them ridiculous, and offensive to a sober good man. So that in effect religion, which should mo.: distinguish us from beasts, and ought most peculiarly to elevate us, as rational creatures, above brutes, is that wherein men often appear most irrational, and more senseless than beasts themselves. Credo, quia impossibile est; I believe, because it is impossible, might in a good man pass for a folly of zeal; but would prove a very ill rule for men to choose their opinions or religion by.

CHAP. XIX.

OF ENTHUSIASM.

§ 1. *Love of Truth necessary.*

HE that would seriously set upon the search of truth, ought in the first place to prepare his mind with a love of it. For he that loves it not, will not take much pains to get it, nor be much concerned when he misses it. There is nobody in the commonwealth of learning, who does not profess himself a lover of truth; and there is not a rational creature, that would not take it amiss to be thought otherwise of. And yet for all this, one may truly say, there are very few lovers of truth for truth-sake, even amongst those who persuade themselves that they are so. How a man may know whether he be so in earnest, is worth inquiry: And I think there is this one unerring mark of it, *viz.* The not entertaining any proposition with greater assurance, than the proofs it is built upon will warrant. Whoever goes beyond this measure of assent, it is plain receives not truth in the love of it; loves not truth for truth-sake, but for some other by-end. For the evidence that any proposition is true (except such as are self-evident) lying only in the proofs a man has of it, whatsoever degrees of assent he affords it beyond the degrees of that evidence, it is plain all that superfluous assurance is owing to some other affection, and not to the love of truth: it being as impossible, that the love of truth should carry my assent above the evidence that there is to me that it is true, as that the love of truth should make me assent to any proposition for the sake of that evidence, which it has not, that it is true; which is in effect to love it as a truth, because it is possible or probable that it may not be true. In any truth that gets not possession of our minds by the irresistible light of self-evidence, or by the force of demonstration, the arguments that gain it assent are the vouchers and gage of its probability to us; and we can receive it for no other, than such as they deliver it to our understandings. Whatsoever credit or authority we give to any

proposition, more than it receives from the principles and proofs it supports itself upon, is owing to our inclinations that way, and is so far a derogation from the love of truth, as such: which, as it can receive no evidence from our passions or interests, so it should receive no tincture from them.

§ 2. *A Forwardness to Dictate, from whence.*

THE assuming an authority of dictating to others, and a forwardness to prescribe to their opinions, is a constant concomitant of this bias and corruption of our judgments. For how almost can it be otherwise, but that he should be ready to impose on others belief, who has already imposed on his own? Who can reasonably expect arguments and conviction from him, in dealing with others, whose understanding is not accustomed to them in his dealing with himself? Who does violence to his own faculties, tyrannizes over his own mind, and usurps the prerogative that belongs to truth alone, which is to command assent by only its own authority, *i. e.* by and in proportion to that evidence which it carries with it.

§ 3. *Force of Enthusiasm.*

UPON this occasion I shall take the liberty to consider a third ground of assent, which with some men has the same authority, and is as confidently relied on as either *faith* or *reason*; I mean *enthusiasm*: which laying by reason, would set up revelation without it. Whereby in effect it takes away both reason and revelation, and substitutes in the room of it the ungrounded fancies of a man's own brain, and assumes them for a foundation both of opinion and conduct.

§ 4. *Reason and Revelation.*

REASON is natural *revelation*, whereby the eternal Father of light, and Fountain of all knowledge, communicates to mankind that portion of truth which he has laid within the reach of their natural faculties: *Revelation* is natural *reason* enlarged by a new set of discoveries communicated by GOD immediately, which *reason* vouches the truth of, by the testimony and proofs it gives that they come from GOD. So that he that takes away *reason*,

to make way for *revelation*, puts out the light of both, and does much-what the same, as if he would persuade a man to put out his eyes, the better to receive the remote light of an invisible star by a telescope.

§ 5. *Rise of Enthusiasm.*

IMMEDIATE *revelation* being a much easier way for men to establish their opinions, and regulate their conduct, than the tedious and not always successful labour of strict reasoning, it is no wonder that some have been very apt to pretend to revelation, and to persuade themselves that they are under the peculiar guidance of Heaven in their actions and opinions, especially in those of them which they cannot account for by the ordinary methods of knowledge, and principles of reason. Hence we see, that in all ages, men, in whom melancholy has mixed with devotion, or whose conceit of themselves has raised them into an opinion of a greater familiarity with GOD, and a nearer admittance to his favour than is afforded to others, have often flattered themselves with a persuasion of an immediate intercourse with the Deity, and frequent communications from the Divine Spirit. GOD, I own, cannot be denied to be able to enlighten the understanding by a ray darted into the mind immediately from the Fountain of light: This they understand he has promised to do, and who then has so good a title to expect it as those who are his peculiar people, chosen by him, and depending on him?

§ 6. *Enthusiasm.*

THEIR minds being thus prepared, whatever groundless opinion comes to settle itself strongly upon their fancies, is an illumination from the spirit of GOD, and presently of divine authority: and whatsoever odd action they find in themselves a strong inclination to do, that impulse is concluded to be a call or direction from Heaven, and must be obeyed; it is a commission from above, and they cannot err in executing it.

§ 7.

THIS I take to be properly enthusiasm, which, though founded neither on reason nor divine revelation, but rising from the conceits of a warmed or over-weening brain,

works yet, where it once gets footing, more powerfully on the persuasions and actions of men, than either of those two, or both together : Men being most forwardly obedient to the impulses they receive from themselves : and the whole man is sure to act more vigorously, where the whole man is carried by a natural motion. For strong conceit, like a new principle, carries all easily with it, when got above common sense, and freed from all restraint of reason, and check of reflection, it is heightened into a divine authority, in concurrence with our own temper and inclination.

§ 8. *Enthusiasm mistaken for seeing and feeling.*

THOUGH the odd opinions and extravagant actions *enthusiasm* has run men into, were enough to warn them against this wrong principle, so apt to misguide them both in their belief and conduct ; yet the love of something extraordinary, the ease and glory it is to be inspired, and be above the common and natural ways of knowledge, so flatters many mens laziness, ignorance and vanity, that when once they are got into this way of immediate revelation, of illumination without search, and of certainty without proof, and without examination, it is a hard matter to get them out of it. Reason is lost upon them, they are above it : they see the light infused into their understandings, and cannot be mistaken ; it is clear and visible there, like the light of bright sunshine : shows itself, and needs no other proof but its own evidence : they feel the hand of GOD moving them within, and the impulses of the Spirit, and cannot be mistaken in what they feel. Thus they support themselves, and are sure reason hath nothing to do with what they see and feel in themselves : what they have a sensible experience of, admits no doubt, needs no probation. Would he not be ridiculous, who should require to have it proved to him that the light shines, and that he sees it ? It is its own proof, and can have no other. When the Spirit brings light into our minds, it dispels darkness. We see it, as we do that of the sun at noon, and need not the twilight of reason to show it us. This light from Heaven is strong, clear, and pure, carries its own

demonstration with it ; and we may as rationally take a glow worm to assist us to discover the sun, as to examine the celestial ray by our dim candle, reason.

§ 9.

THIS is the way of talking of these men ; they are sure, because they are sure : and their persuasions are right, only because they are strong in them. For, when what they say is stripped of the metaphor of seeing and feeling, this is all it amounts to : and yet these similes so impose on them, that they serve them for certainty in themselves, and demonstration to others.

§ 10. *Enthusiasm how to be discovered.*

BUT to examine a little soberly this internal light, and this feeling on which they build so much. These men have, they say, clear light, and they see ; they have an awakened sense, and they feel : this cannot, they are sure, be disputed them. For when a man says he sees or he feels, nobody can deny it him that he does so. But here let me ask : This seeing, is it the perception of the truth of the proposition, or of this, that it is a revelation from GOD ? This feeling, is it a perception of an inclination or fancy to do something, or of the spirit of GOD moving that inclination ? These are two very different perceptions, and must be carefully distinguished, if we would not impose upon ourselves. I may perceive the truth of a proposition, and yet not perceive that it is an immediate revelation from God. I may perceive the truth of a proposition in *Euclid*, without its being, or my perceiving it to be a revelation : Nay, I may perceive I came not by this knowledge in a natural way, and so may conclude it revealed, without perceiving that it is a revelation from GOD ; because there be spirits, which, without being divinely commissioned, may excite those *ideas* in me, and lay them in such order before my mind, that I may perceive their connection. So that the knowledge of any proposition coming into my mind I know not how, is not a perception that it is from GOD. Much less is a strong persuasion, that it is true, a perception that it is from GOD, or so much as true. But however it be called light and seeing, I

suppose it is at most but belief and assurance : and the proposition taken for a revelation, is not such as they know to be true, but take to be true. For where a proposition is known to be true, revelation is needless : and it is hard to conceive how there can be a revelation to any one of what he knows already. If, therefore, it be a proposition which they are persuaded, but do not know to be true, whatever they may call it, it is not seeing, but believing. For these are two ways, whereby truth comes into the mind, wholly distinct, so that one is not the other. What I see, I know to be so by the evidence of the thing itself : what I believe, I take to be so upon the testimony of another : But this testimony I must know to be given, or else what ground have I of believing ? I must see that it is GOD that reveals this to me, or else I see nothing. The question then here is, how do I know that GOD is the revealer of this to me ; that this impression is made upon my mind by his holy Spirit, and that therefore I ought to obey it ? If I know not this, how great soever the assurance is that I am possessed with, it is groundless ; whatever light I pretend to, it is but *enthusiasm*. For whether the proposition supposed to be revealed, be in itself evidently true, or visibly probable, or by the natural ways of knowledge uncertain, the proposition that must be well grounded, and manifested to be true, is this, that GOD is the revealer of it, and that what I take to be a revelation is certainly put into my mind by him, and is not an illusion dropped in by some other spirit, or raised by my own fancy. For if I mistake not, these men receive it for true, because they presume GOD revealed it. Does it not then stand them upon, to examine on what grounds they presume it to be a revelation from GOD ? or else all their confidence is mere presumption : and this light, they are so dazzled with, is nothing but an *ignis fatuus* that leads them continually round in this circle ; *it is a revelation, because they firmly believe it ; and they believe it, because it is a revelation.*

§ 11. *Enthusiasm fails of Evidence, that the Proposition is from GOD.*

IN all that is of divine *revelation*, there is need of no other proof but that it is an inspiration from GOD: for he can neither deceive, nor be deceived. But how shall it be known that any proposition in our minds is a truth infused by GOD; a truth that is revealed to us by him, which he declares to us, and therefore we ought to believe? Here it is that *enthusiasm* fails of the evidence it pretends to. For men thus possessed boast of a light whereby, they say they are enlightened, and brought into the knowledge of this or that truth. But if they know it to be a truth, they must know it to be so, either by its own self-evidence to natural reason, or by the rational proofs that make it out to be so. If they see and know it to be a truth, either of these two ways, they in vain suppose it to be a revelation. For they know it to be true by the same way, that any other man naturally may know that it is so without the help of revelation. For thus all the truths, of what kind soever, that men uninspired are enlightened with, came into their minds, and are established there. If they say they know it to be true, because it is a revelation from GOD, the reason is good: but then it will be demanded how they know it to be a revelation from God? If they say, by the light it brings with it, which shines bright in their minds, and they cannot resist: I beseech them to consider, whether this be any more than what we have taken notice of already, *viz.* That it is a revelation, because they strongly believe it to be true. For all the light they speak of is but a strong, though ungrounded, persuasion of their own minds, that it is a truth. For rational grounds from proofs that it is a truth, they must acknowledge to have none; for then it is not received as a revelation, but upon the ordinary grounds that other truths are received: and if they believe it to be true, because it is a revelation, and have no other reason for its being a revelation, but because they are fully persuaded without any other reason that it is true, they believe it to be a revelation only because they strongly believe it to be a revelation;

which is a very unsafe ground to proceed on, either in our tenets or actions. And what readier way can there be to run ourselves into the most extravagant errors and miscarriages, than thus to set up fancy for our supreme and sole guide, and to believe any proposition to be true, any action to be right, only because we believe it to be so? The strength of our persuasions are no evidence at all of their own rectitude: crooked things may be as stiff and inflexible as straight: and men may be as positive and peremptory in error as in truth. How come else the untractable zealots in different and opposite parties? For if the light, which every one thinks he has in his mind, which in this case is nothing but the strength of his own persuasion, be an evidence that it is from GOD, contrary opinions may have the same title to be inspirations; and GOD will be not only the father of lights, but of opposite and contradictory lights, leading men contrary ways; and contradictory propositions will be divine truths if an ungrounded strength of assurance be an evidence, that any proposition is a divine revelation.

§ 12. *Firmness of Persuasion no Proof that any Proposition is from GOD.*

THIS cannot be otherwise, whilst firmness of persuasion is made the cause of believing, and confidence of being in the right is made an argument of truth. St. Paul himself believed he did well, and that he had a call to it when he persecuted the Christians, whom he confidently thought in the wrong: but yet it was he, and not they, who were mistaken. Good men are men still, liable to mistakes; and are sometimes warmly engaged in errors, which they take for divine truths, shining in their minds with the clearest light.

§ 13. *Light in the Mind, what.*

LIGHT, true light in the mind is, or can be nothing else but the evidence of the truth of any proposition, and if it be not a self-evident proposition all the light it has, or can have, is from the clearness and validity of those proofs, upon which it is received. To talk of any other light in the understanding, is to put ourselves in the dark, or in the power of the Prince of Dark-

§ 11. *Enthusiasm fails of Evidence, that the Proposition is from GOD.*

IN all that is of divine *revelation*, there is need of no other proof but that it is an inspiration from GOD: for he can neither deceive, nor be deceived. But how shall it be known that any proposition in our minds is a truth infused by GOD; a truth that is revealed to us by him, which he declares to us, and therefore we ought to believe? Here it is that *enthusiasm* fails of the evidence it pretends to. For men thus possessed boast of a light whereby, they say they are enlightened, and brought into the knowledge of this or that truth. But if they know it to be a truth, they must know it to be so, either by its own self-evidence to natural reason, or by the rational proofs that make it out to be so. If they see and know it to be a truth, either of these two ways, they in vain suppose it to be a revelation. For they know it to be true by the same way, that any other man naturally may know that it is so without the help of revelation. For thus all the truths, of what kind soever, that men uninspired are enlightened with, came into their minds, and are established there. If they say they know it to be true, because it is a revelation from GOD, the reason is good: but then it will be demanded how they know it to be a revelation from God? If they say, by the light it brings with it, which shines bright in their minds, and they cannot resist: I beseech them to consider, whether this be any more than what we have taken notice of already, *viz.* That it is a revelation, because they strongly believe it to be true. For all the light they speak of is but a strong, though ungrounded, persuasion of their own minds, that it is a truth. For rational grounds from proofs that it is a truth, they must acknowledge to have none; for then it is not received as a revelation, but upon the ordinary grounds that other truths are received: and if they believe it to be true, because it is a revelation, and have no other reason for its being a revelation, but because they are fully persuaded without any other reason that it is true, they believe it to be a revelation only because they strongly believe it to be a revelation;

which is a very unsafe ground to proceed on, either in our tenets or actions. And what readier way can there be to run ourselves into the most extravagant errors and miscarriages, than thus to set up fancy for our supreme and sole guide, and to believe any proposition to be true, any action to be right, only because we believe it to be so? The strength of our persuasions are no evidence at all of their own rectitude: crooked things may be as stiff and unflexible as streight: and men may be as positive and peremptory in error as in truth. How come else the untractable zealots in different and opposite parties? For if the light, which every one thinks he has in his mind, which in this case is nothing but the strength of his own persuasion, be an evidence that it is from GOD, contrary opinions may have the same title to be inspirations; and GOD will be not only the father of lights, but of opposite and contradictory lights, leading men contrary ways; and contradictory propositions will be divine truths if an ungrounded strength of assurance be an evidence, that any proposition is a divine revelation.

§ 12. *Firmness of Persuasion no Proof that any Proposition is from GOD.*

THIS cannot be otherwise, whilst firmness of persuasion is made the cause of believing, and confidence of being in the right is made an argument of truth. St. Paul himself believed he did well, and that he had a call to it when he persecuted the Christians, whom he confidently thought in the wrong: but yet it was he, and not they, who were mistaken. Good men are men still, liable to mistakes; and are sometimes warmly engaged in errors, which they take for divine truths, shining in their minds with the clearest light.

§ 13. *Light in the Mind, what.*

LIGHT, true light in the mind is, or can be nothing else but the evidence of the truth of any proposition, and if it be not a self-evident proposition all the light it has, or can have, is from the clearness and validity of those proofs, upon which it is received. To talk of any other light in the understanding, is to put ourselves in the dark, or in the power of the Prince of Dark-

ness, and by our own consent to give ourselves up to delusion to believe a lie. For if strength of persuasion be the light which must guide us; I ask how shall any one distinguish between the delusions of Satan, and the inspiration of the Holy Ghost? He can transform himself into an angel of light. And they who are led by this Son of the Morning, are as fully satisfied of the illumination, *i. e.* are as strongly persuaded, that they are enlightened by the spirit of God, as any one who is so: they acquiesce and rejoice in it, are acted by it: and nobody can be more sure, nor more in the right (if their own strong belief may be judge) than they.

§ 14. *Revelation must be judged of by Reason.*

HE, therefore, that will not give himself up to all the extravagancies of delusion and error, must bring this guide of his light within to the trial. GOD, when he makes the prophet, does not unmake the man. He leaves all his faculties in their natural state, to enable him to judge of his inspirations, whether they be of divine original or no. When he illuminates the mind with supernatural light, he does not extinguish that which is natural. If he would have us assent to the truth of any proposition, he either evidences that truth by the usual methods of natural reason, or else makes it known to be a truth which he would have us assent to, by his authority; and convinces us that it is from him, by some marks which reason cannot be mistaken in. *Reason* must be our last judge and guide in every thing. I do not mean that we must consult reason, and examine whether a proposition revealed from GOD can be made out by natural principles, and if it cannot, that then we may reject it: but consult it we must, and by it examine, whether it be a revelation from GOD or no. And if *reason* finds it to be revealed from GOD, *reason* then declares for it, as much as for any other truth, and makes it one of her dictates. Every conceit that thoroughly warms our fancies must pass for an inspiration, if there be nothing but the strength of our persuasions, whereby to judge of our persuasions: if *reason* must not examine their truth by something extrinsical to the persuasions themselves, in-

spirations and delusions, truth and falsehood, will have the same measure, and will not be possible to be distinguished.

§ 15. *Belief no Proof of Revelation.*

IF this internal light, or any proposition which under that title we take for inspired, be conformable to the principles of reason, or to the word of GOD, which is attested revelation, *reason* warrants it, and we may safely receive it for true, and be guided by it in our belief and actions: if it receive no testimony nor evidence from either of these rules, we cannot take it for a revelation, or so much as for true, till we have some other mark that it is a revelation, besides our believing that it is so. Thus we see the holy men of old, who had revelations from GOD, had something else besides that internal light of assurance in their own minds, to testify to them that it was from GOD. They were not left to their own persuasions alone, that those persuasions were from GOD; but had outward signs to convince them of the Author of those revelations. And when they were to convince others, they had a power given them to justify the truth of their commission from Heaven; and by visible signs to assert the divine authority of a message they were sent with. *Moses* saw the bush burn without being consumed, and heard a voice out of it. This was something besides finding an impulse upon his mind to go to *Pharaoh*, that he might bring his brethren out of *Egypt*: and yet he thought not this enough to authorise him to go with that message, till GOD, by another miracle of his rod turned into a serpent, had assured him of a power to testify his mission, by the same miracle repeated before them, whom he was sent to. *Gideon* was sent by an angel to deliver *Israel* from the *Midianites*, and yet he desired a sign to convince him that this commission was from GOD. These, and several the like instances to be found among the prophets of old, are enough to show that they thought not an inward seeing or persuasion of their own minds, without any other proof, a sufficient evidence that it was from GOD, though the Scripture

does not every where mention their demanding or having such proofs.

§ 16.

IN what I have said, I am far from denying, that GOD can, or doth sometimes enlighten mens-minds in the apprehending of certain truths; or excite them to good actions by the immediate influence and assistance of the Holy Spirit, without any extraordinary signs accompanying it. But in such cases too we have reason and the scripture, unerring rules to know whether it be from GOD or no. Where the truth embraced is consonant to the revelation in the written word of GOD, or the action conformable to dictates of right *reason* or holy writ, we may be assured that we run no risk in entertaining it as such; because though perhaps it be not an immediate revelation from GOD, extraordinarily operating on our minds, yet we are sure it is warranted by that revelation which he has given us of truth. But it is not the strength of our private persuasion within ourselves, that can warrant it to be a light or motion from Heaven; nothing can do that but the written word of GOD without us, or that standard of reason which is common to us with all men. Where reason or scripture is express for any opinion or action, we may receive it as of divine authority: but it is not the strength of our own persuasions which can by itself give it that stamp. The bent of our own minds may favour it as much as we please: that may show it to be a fondling of our own, but will by no means prove it to be an offspring of Heaven, and of divine original.

CHAP. XX.

OF WRONG ASSENT, OR ERROR.

§ 1. *Causes of Error.*

KNOWLEDGE being to be had only of visible certain truth, *error* is not a fault of our knowledge, but a mistake of our judgment, giving assent to that which is not true.

But if assent be grounded on likelihood, if the proper object and motive of our assent be probability, and that probability consists in what is laid down in the foregoing chapters, it will be demanded, how men come to give their assents contrary to probability. For there is nothing more common than contrariety of opinions; nothing more obvious than that one man wholly disbelieves what another only doubts of, and a third stedfastly believes, and firmly adheres to. The reasons whereof, though they may be very various, yet, I suppose, may be all reduced to these four.

1. *Want of proofs.*
2. *Want of ability to use them.*
3. *Want of will to use them.*
4. *Wrong measures of probability.*

§ 2. 1. *Want of Proofs.*

FIRST, By *want of proofs*, I do not mean only the want of those proofs which are no where extant, and so are no where to be had; but the want even of those proofs which are in being, or might be procured. And thus men want proofs who have not the convenience or opportunity to make experiments and observations themselves tending to the proof of any proposition; nor likewise the convenience to inquire into, and collect the testimonies of others: and in this state are the greatest part of mankind, who are given up to labour, and enslaved to the necessity of their mean condition; whose lives are worn out only in the provisions for living. These mens opportunity of knowledge and inquiry are commonly as narrow as their fortunes; and their understandings are but little instructed, when all their whole time and pains is laid out to still the croaking of their own bellies, or the cries of their children. It is not to be expected that a man who drudges on all his life in a laborious trade, should be more knowing in the variety of things done in the world, than a pack-horse, who is driven constantly forwards and backwards in a narrow lane, and dirty road, only to market, should be skilled in the geography of the country. Nor is it at all more possible that he who wants leisure, books, and languages, and the opportunity of conversing

with a variety of men, should be in a condition to collect those testimonies and observations which are in being, and are necessary to make out many, nay most of the propositions that, in the societies of men, are judged of the greatest moment; or to find out grounds of assurance so great as the belief of the points he would build on them, is thought necessary; so that a great part of mankind are, by the natural and unalterable state of things in this world, and the constitution of human affairs, unavoidably given over to invincible ignorance of those proofs on which others build, and which are necessary to establish those opinions: the greatest part of men, having much to do to get the means of living, are not in a condition to look after those of learned and laborious inquiries.

§ 3. Ob. *What shall become of those who want them, answered.*

WHAT shall we say then? Are the greatest part of mankind, by the necessity of their condition, subjected to unavoidable ignorance in those things which are of greatest importance to them? (for of these it is obvious to inquire.) Have the bulk of mankind no other guide but accident, and blind chance, to conduct them to their happiness or misery? Are the current opinions, and licensed guides of every country, sufficient evidence and security to every man to venture his greatest concerns on; nay, his everlasting happiness or misery? Or, can those be the certain and infallible oracles and standards of truth, which teach one thing in *Christendom*, and another in *Turkey*? Or, shall a poor countryman be eternally happy for having the chance to be born in *Italy*: or a day-labourer be unavoidable lost, because he had the ill luck to be born in *England*? How ready some men may be to say some of these things, I will not here examine: but this I am sure, that men must allow one or other of these to be true (let them choose which they please), or else grant, that God has furnished men with faculties sufficient to direct them in the way they should take, if they will but seriously employ them that way, when their ordinary vocations allow them the leisure.

No man is so wholly taken up with the attendance on the means of living, as to have no spare time at all to think of his soul, and inform himself in matters of religion. Were men as intent upon this, as they are on things of lower concernment, there are none so enslaved to the necessities of life, who might not find many vacancies that might be husbanded to this advantage of their knowledge.

§ 4. *People hindered from Inquiry.*

BESIDES those, whose improvements and informations are straitened by the narrowness of their fortunes, there are others whose largeness of fortune would plentifully enough supply books and other requisites for clearing of doubts, and discovering of truth: but they are *cooped in close, by the laws* of their countries, and the strict guards of those whose interest it is to keep them ignorant, lest, knowing more, they should believe the less in them. These are as far, nay farther *from the liberty and opportunities of a fair inquiry*, than those poor and wretched labourers we before spoke of. And, however they may seem high and great, are confined to narrowness of thought, and enslaved in that which should be the freest part of man, their understandings. This is generally the case of all those who live in places where care is taken to propagate truth without knowledge; where men are forced, at a venture, to be of the religion of the country; and must therefore swallow down opinions, as silly people do empirics pills, without knowing what they are made of, or how they will work, and have nothing to do but believe that they will do the cure: but in this are much more miserable than they, in that they are not at liberty to refuse swallowing what perhaps they had rather let alone; or to choose the physician, to whose conduct they would trust themselves.

§ 5. 2. *Want of Skill to use them.*

SECONDLY, Those who *want skill to use those evidences they have* of probabilities; who cannot carry a train of consequences in their heads, nor weigh exactly the preponderancy of contrary proofs and testimonies, making every circumstance its due allowance, may be easily

missed to assent to positions that are not probable. There are some men of one, some but of two syllogisms, and no more; and others that can but advance one step farther. These cannot always discern that side on which the strongest proofs lie; cannot constantly follow that which in itself is the more probable opinion. Now that there is such a difference between men, in respect of their understandings, I think nobody, who has had any conversation with his neighbours, will question: though he never was at *Westminster-hall*, or the *Exchange*, on the one hand; nor at *Alms-houses*, or *Bedlam*, on the other. Which great difference in mens intellects, whether it rises from any defect in the organs of the body, particularly adapted to thinking; or in the dullness or untractableness of those faculties for want of use; or, as some think, in the natural differences of mens souls themselves; or some, or all of these together; it matters not here to examine: Only this is evident, that there is a difference of degrees in mens understandings, apprehensions, and reasonings, to so great a latitude, that one may, without doing injury to mankind, affirm, that there is a greater distance between some men and others, in this respect, than between some men and some beasts. But how this comes about is a speculation, though of great consequence, yet not necessary to our present purpose.

§ 6. 3. *Want of Will to use them.*

THIRDLY, There are another sort of people that *want proofs*, not because they are out of their reach, but *because they will not use them*: who though they have riches and leisure enough, and want neither parts nor other helps, are yet never the better for them. Their hot pursuit of pleasure, or constant drudgery in business, engages some mens thoughts elsewhere: Laziness and idleness in general, or a particular aversion for books, study, and meditation, keep others from any serious thoughts at all: and some out of fear, that an impartial inquiry would not favour those opinions which best suit their prejudices, lives, and designs, content themselves without examination to take upon trust what they find

convenient and in fashion. Thus most men, even of those that might do otherwise, pass their lives without an acquaintance with, much less a rational assent to probabilities they are concerned to know, though they lie so much within their view, that to be convinced of them, they need but turn their eyes that way. But we know some men will not read a letter which is supposed to bring ill news; and many men forbear to cast up their accounts, or so much as think upon their estates, who have reason to fear their affairs are in no very good posture. How men, whose plentiful fortunes allow them leisure to improve their understandings, can satisfy themselves with a lazy ignorance, I cannot tell: But methinks they have a low opinion of their souls; who lay out all their incomes in provisions for the body, and employ none of it to procure the means and helps of knowledge; who take great care to appear always in a neat and splendid outside, and would think themselves miserable in coarse clothes, or a patched coat, and yet contentedly suffer their minds to appear abroad in a pie-bald livery of coarse patches, and borrowed shreds, such as it has pleased chance, or their country tailor (I mean the common opinion of those they have conversed with), to clothe them in. I will not here mention how unreasonable this is for men that ever think of a future state, and their concernment in it, which no rational man can avoid to do sometimes: nor shall I take notice what a shame and confusion it is, to the greatest contemners of knowledge, to be found ignorant in things they are concerned to know. But this at least is worth the consideration of those who call themselves gentlemen, that however they may think credit, respect, power, and authority, the concomitants of their birth and fortune; yet they will find all these still carried away from them, by men of lower condition, who surpass them in knowledge. They who are blind will always be led by those that see, or else fall into the ditch: and he is certainly the most subjected, the most enslaved, who is so in his understanding. In the foregoing instances, some of the causes have been shown of wrong assent, and how it

comes to pass, that probable doctrines are not always received with an assent proportionable to the reasons which are to be had for their probability: but hitherto we have considered only such probabilities, whose proofs do exist, but do not appear to him that embraces the error.

§ 7. 4. *Wrong Measures of Probability; Whereof.*

FOURTHLY, There remains yet the last sort, who, even where the real probabilities appear, and are plainly laid before them, do not admit of the conviction, nor yield unto manifest reasons, but do either *ἰνίχην*, suspend their assent, or give it to the less probable opinion: And to this danger are those exposed, who have taken up *wrong measures of probability*; which are,

1. *Propositions that are not in themselves certain and evident, but doubtful and false, taken up for Principles.*

2. *Received Hypotheses.*

3. *Predominant Passions or Inclinations.*

4. *Authority.*

§ 8. 1. *Doubtful Propositions taken for Principles.*

FIRST, The first and firmest ground of probability, is the conformity any thing has to our own knowledge; especially that part of our knowledge which we have embraced, and continue to look on as *principles*. These have so great an influence upon our opinions, that it is usually by them we judge of truth, and measure probability to that degree, that what is inconsistent with our *principles*, is so far from passing for probable with us, that it will not be allowed possible. The reverence borne to these *principles* is so great, and their authority so paramount to all other, that the testimony not only of other men, but the evidence of our own senses are often rejected, when they offer to vouch any thing contrary to these established rules. How much the doctrine of innate *principles*, and that *principles* are not to be proved or questioned, has contributed to this, I will not here examine. This I readily grant, that one truth cannot contradict another: but withal I take leave also to say, that every one ought very carefully to beware what he admits for a *principle*, to examine it strictly, and see

whether he certainly knows it to be true of itself by its own evidence, or whether he does only with assurance believe it to be so upon the authority of others. For he hath a strong bias put into his understanding, which will unavoidably misguide his assent, who hath imbibed *wrong principles*, and has blindly given himself up to the authority of any opinion in itself not evidently true.

§ 9.

THERE is nothing more ordinary, than that children should receive into their minds propositions (especially about matters of religion) from their parents, nurses, or those about them : which being insinuated into their unwary, as well as unbiaſſed understandings, and fastened by degrees, are at last (equally, whether true or false) rivetted there by long custom and education, beyond all possibility of being pulled out again. For men, when they are grown up, reflecting upon their opinions, and finding those of this sort to be as ancient in their minds as their very memories, not having observed their early insinuation, nor by what means they got them, they are apt to reverence them as sacred things, and not to suffer them to be profaned, touched, or questioned : They look on them as the *Urim* and *Thummim* set up in their minds immediately by GOD himself, to be the great and unerring deciders of truth and falsehood, and the judges to which they are to appeal in all manner of controversies.

§ 10.

THIS opinion of his *principles* (let them be what they will) being *once established in any one's mind*, it is easy to be imagined what reception any proposition shall find, how clearly soever proved, that shall invalidate their authority, or at all thwart with these internal oracles ; whereas the grossest absurdities and improbabilities, being but agreeable to such principles, go down glibly, and are easily digested. The great obstinacy that is to be found in men firmly believing quite contrary opinions, though many times equally absurd, in the various religions of mankind, are as evident a proof as they are an unavoidable consequence of this way of reasoning

from received traditional principles. So that men will disbelieve their own eyes, renounce the evidence of their senses, and give their own experience the lie, rather than admit of any thing disagreeing with these sacred tenets. Take an intelligent *Romanist*, that from the very first dawning of any notions in his understanding, hath had this principle constantly inculcated, *viz.* that he must believe as the church (*i. e.* those of his communion) believes, or that the Pope is infallible; and this he never so much as heard questioned, till at forty or fifty years old he met with one of other principles: how is he prepared easily to swallow, not only against all probability, but even the clear evidence of his senses, the doctrine of *transubstantiation*? This principle has such an influence on his mind, that he will believe that to be flesh which he sees to be bread. And what way will you take to convince a man of any improbable opinion he holds, who, with some philosophers, hath laid down this as a foundation of reasoning, that he must believe his reason (for so men improperly call arguments drawn from their principles) against his senses? Let an *enthusiast* be principled, that he or his teacher is inspired, and acted by an immediate communication of the Divine Spirit, and you in vain bring the evidence of clear reasons against his doctrine. Whoever, therefore, have imbibed wrong *principles*, are not, in things inconsistent with these principles, to be moved by the most apparent and convincing probabilities, till they are so candid and ingenuous to themselves, as to be persuaded to examine even those very *principles*, which many never suffer themselves to do.

§ 11. 2. *Received Hypotheses.*

SECONDLY, Next to these are men whose understandings are cast into a mold, and fashioned just to the size of a *received hypothesis*. The difference between these and the former, is, that they will admit of matter of fact, and agree with dissenters in that; but differ only in assigning of reasons, and explaining the manner of operation. These are not at that open defiance with their senses, as the former: they can endure to hearken

to their information a little more patiently; but wilbly no means admit of their reports in the explanation of things; nor be prevailed on by probabilities, which would convince them that things are not brought about just after the same manner that they have decreed within themselves that they are. Would it not be an insufferable thing for a learned professor, and that which his scarlet would blush at, to have his authority of forty years standing wrought out of hard rock, *Greek and Latin*, with no small expence of time and candle, and confirmed by general tradition and a reverend beard, in an instant overturned by an upstart novelist? Can any one expect that he should be made to confess, that what he taught his scholars thirty years ago, was all error and mistake: and that he sold them hard words and ignorance at a very dear rate? What probabilities, I say, are sufficient to prevail in such a case? And whoever by the most cogent arguments will be prevailed with, to disrobe himself at once of all his old opinions, and pretences to knowledge and learning, which with hard study he hath all his time been labouring for; and turn himself out stark naked, in quest a-fresh of new notions? All the arguments can be used, will be as little able to prevail, as the wind did with the traveller to part with his cloak, which he held only the faster. To this of wrong hypothesis, may be reduced the errors that may be occasioned by a true hypothesis, or right principles, but not rightly understood. There is nothing more familiar than this. The instances of men contending for different opinions, which they all derive from the infallible truth of the Scripture, are an undeniable proof of it. All that call themselves Christians, allow the text, that says, *Méavouïs*, to carry in it the obligation to a very weighty duty. But yet however erroneous will one of their practices be, who understanding nothing but the *French*, take this rule with one translation to be *repentez vous*, repent; or with the other *faitiez penitence*, do penance.

§ 12. 3. *Predominant Passions.*

THIRDLY, Probabilities, which cross mens appetites and

prevailing passions, run the same fate. Let never so much probability hang on one side of a covetous man's reasoning, and money on the other; it is easy to foresee which will outweigh. Earthly minds, like mud-walls, resist the strongest batteries: and though perhaps sometimes the force of a clear argument may make some impression; yet they nevertheless stand firm, keep out the enemy truth, that would captivate or disturb them. Tell a man, passionately in love, that he is jilted; bring a score of witnesses of the falsehood of his mistress, it is ten to one but three kind words of hers shall invalidate all their testimonies. *Quod volumus, facile credimus; what suits our wishes, is forwardly believed*; is, I suppose, what every one hath more than once experimented: and though men cannot always openly gainsay or resist the force of manifest probabilities that make against them, yet yield they not to the argument. Not but that it is the nature of the understanding constantly to close with the more probable side; but yet a man hath a power to suspend and restrain its inquiries, and not permit a full and satisfactory examination, as far as the matter in question is capable, and will bear it to be made. Until that be done, there will be always these *two ways left of evading the most apparent probabilities*.

§ 13. *The means of evading Probabilities: 1. Supposed Fallacy.*

FIRST, That the arguments being (as for the most part they are), brought in words, *there may be a fallacy latent in them*: and the consequences being, perhaps, many in train, they may be some of them incoherent. There are very few discourses so short, clear, and consistent, to which most men may not, with satisfaction enough to themselves, raise this doubt; and from whose conviction they may not, without reproach of dissingenuity or unreasonableness, set themselves free with the old reply, *Non persuadebis, etiamsi persuaseris; though I cannot answer, I will not yield*.

§ 14. *2. Supposed Arguments for the contrary.*
SECONDLY, Manifest probabilities may be evaded, and the assent withheld upon this suggestion, that *I know*

not yet all that may be said on the contrary side : And therefore though I be beaten, it is not necessary I should yield, not knowing what forces there are in reserve behind. This is a refuge against *conviction* so open and so wide, that it is hard to determine, when a man is quite out of the verge of it.

§ 15. *What Probabilities determine the Assent.*

BUT yet there is some end of it ; and a man having carefully inquired into all the grounds of probability and and unlikeliness, done his utmost to inform himself in all particulars fairly, and cast up the sum total on both sides, may in most cases come to acknowledge, upon the whole matter, on which side the probability rests : wherein some proofs in matter of reason, being suppositions upon universal experience, are so cogent and clear ; and some testimonies in matter of fact so universal, that he cannot refuse his assent. So that, I think, we may conclude, that in propositions, where though the proofs in view are of most moment, yet there are sufficient grounds to suspect that there is either fallacy in words, or certain proofs as considerable to be produced on the contrary side, there assent, suspense, or dissent are often voluntary actions : But where the proofs are such as make it highly probable, and there is not sufficient ground to suspect, that there is either fallacy of words (which sober and serious consideration may discover), nor equally valid proofs, yet undiscovered, latent on the other side (which also the nature of the thing may, in some cases, make plain to a considerate man), there, I think, a *man*, who has weighed them, *can scarce refuse his assent* to the side, on which the greater probability appears. Whether it be probable, that a promiscuous jumble of printing letters should often fall into a method and order, which should stamp on paper a coherent discourse ; or that a blind fortuitous concurrence of atoms, not guided by an understanding agent, should frequently constitute the bodies of any species of animals : in these and the like cases, I think, nobody that considers them can be one jot at a stand which side to take, nor at all waver in his assent. Lastly, When

there can be no supposition (the thing in its own nature indifferent, and wholly depending upon the testimony of witnesses), that there is as fair testimony against, as for the matter of fact attested; which by inquiry is to be learned, *v. g.* whether there was 1700 years ago such a man at *Rome* as *Julius Caesar*: in all such cases, I say, I think it is not in any rational man's power to refuse his assent; but that it necessarily follows, and closes with such probabilities. In other less clear cases, I think it is in a man's power to suspend his assent; and perhaps content himself with the proofs he has, if they favour the opinion that suits with his inclination or interest, and so stop from farther search. But that a man should afford his assent to that side, on which the less probability appears to him, seems to me utterly impracticable, and as impossible, as it is to believe the same thing probable and improbable at the same time.

§ 16. *Where it is in our power to suspend it.*

As knowledge is no more arbitrary than perception; so, I think, assent is no more in our power than knowledge. When the agreement of any two *ideas* appears to our minds, whether immediately, or by the assistance of reason, I can no more refuse to perceive, no more avoid knowing it, than I can avoid seeing those objects which I turn my eyes to, and look on in day-light: And what upon full examination I find the most probable, I cannot deny my assent to. But though we cannot hinder our knowledge, where the agreement is once perceived; nor our assent, where the probability manifestly appears upon due consideration of all the measures of it; yet we can hinder both knowledge and assent, by stopping our inquiry, and not employing our faculties in the search of any truth. If it were not so, ignorance, error, or infidelity could not in any case be a fault. Thus in some cases we can prevent or suspend our assent: But can a man, versed in modern or ancient history, doubt whether there be such a place as *Rome*, or whether there was such a man as *Julius Caesar*? Indeed there are millions of truths, that a man is not, or may not think himself concerned to know; as whether our *King Richard* the

Third was crook-backed, or no; or whether *Roger Bacon* was a mathematician, or a magician. In these and such like cases, where the assent one way or other is of no importance to the interest of any one; no action, no concernment of his following or depending thereon; there it is not strange, that the mind should give itself up to the common opinion, or render itself to the first comer. These and the like opinions are of so little weight and moment, that, like motes in the sun, their tendencies are very rarely taken notice of. They are there, as it were by chance, and the mind lets them float at liberty. But where the mind judges that the proposition has concernment in it; where the assent or not assenting is thought to draw consequences of moment after it, and good or evil to depend on choosing or refusing the right side, and the mind sets itself seriously to inquire and examine the probability; there, I think, it is not in our choice to take which side we please, if manifest odds appear on either. The greater probability, I think, in that case will determine the assent: and a man can no more avoid assenting, or taking it to be true, where he perceives the greater probability, than he can avoid knowing it to be true, where he perceives the agreement or disagreement of any two ideas.

If this be so, the foundation of error will lie in wrong measures of probability; as the foundation of vice in wrong measures of good.

§ 17. 4. *Authority.*

FOURTHLY, The fourth and last *wrong measure of probability* I shall take notice of, and which keeps in ignorance or error more people than all the other together, is that which I have mentioned in the foregoing chapter; I mean, the *giving up our assent to the common received opinions*, either of our friends or party, neighbourhood or country. How many men have no other ground for their tenets, than the supposed honesty, or learning, or number of those of the same profession? As if honest or bookish men could not err, or truth were to be established by the vote of the multitude: yet this with most men serves the turn. The tenet has had the attestation

of reverend antiquity, it comes to me with the passport of former ages, and therefore I am secure in the reception I give it: other men have been, and are of the same opinion (for that is all is said), and therefore it is reasonable for me to embrace it. A man may more justifiably throw up cross and pile for his opinions, than take them up by such measures. All men are liable to error, and most men are in many points, by passion or interest, under temptation to it. If we could but see the secret motives that influenced the men of name and learning in the world, and the leaders of parties, we should not always find that it was the embracing of truth for its own sake, that made them espouse the doctrines they owned and maintained. This at least is certain, there is not an opinion so absurd, which a man may not receive upon this ground: There is no error to be named, which has not had its professors: And a man shall never want crooked paths to walk in, if he thinks that he is in the right way, wherever he has the footsteps of others to follow.

§ 18. *Men not in so many Errors as is imagined.*
 BUT notwithstanding the great noise is made in the world about errors and opinions, I must do mankind that right, as to say, *There are not so many men in errors and wrong opinions, as is commonly supposed.* Not that I think they embrace the truth; but indeed, because concerning those doctrines they keep such a stir about, they have no thought, no opinion at all. For if any one should a little catechise the greatest part of the partisans of most of the sects in the world, he would not find, concerning those matters they are so zealous for, that they have any opinions of their own: much less would he have reason to think, that they took them upon the examination of arguments, and appearance of probability. They are resolved to stick to a party, that education or interest has engaged them in; and there, like the common soldiers of an army, show their courage and warmth as their leaders direct, without ever examining or so much as knowing the cause they contend for. If a man's life shows, that he has no serious regard for religion; for what reason should we think, that he beats

his head about the opinions of his church, and troubles himself to examine the grounds of this or that doctrine? It is enough for him to obey his leaders, to have his hand and his tongue ready for the support of the common cause, and thereby approve himself to those, who can give him credit, preferment or protection in that society. Thus men become professors of, and combatants for those opinions, they were never convinced of, nor proselytes to; no, nor ever had so much as floating in their heads: And though one cannot say, there are fewer improbable or erroneous opinions in the world than there are; yet this is certain, there are fewer that actually assent to them, and mistake them for truths, than is imagined.

CHAP XXI.

OF THE DIVISION OF THE SCIENCES.

§ 1. *Three Sorts.*

ALL that can fall within the compass of human understanding, being either, *First*, The nature of things as they are in themselves, their relations, and their manner of operation: Or, *Secondly*, That which man himself ought to do, as a rational and voluntary agent, for the attainment of any end, especially happiness: Or, *Thirdly*, The ways and means, whereby the knowledge of both the one and the other of these are attained and communicated: I think, *science* may be divided properly into these *three sorts*.

§ 2. 1. *Phyfica.*

FIRST, The knowledge of things, as they are in their own proper beings, their constitutions, properties, and operations; whereby I mean not only matter and body, but spirits also, which have their proper natures, constitutions, and operations, as well as bodies. This in a little more enlarged sense of the word, I call *Φυσική* or *natural philosophy*. The end of this, is bare speculative truth; and whatsoever can afford the mind of man any such, falls under this branch, whether it be God himself,

angels, spirits, bodies, or any of their affections, as number, and figure, &c.

§ 3. 2. Practica.

SECONDLY, Πραξις, The skill of right applying our own powers and actions, for the attainment of things good and useful. The most considerable under this head, is *ethics*, which is the seeking out those rules and measures of human actions, which lead to happiness, and the means to practise them. The end of this is not bare speculation, and the knowledge of truth; but right and a conduct suitable to it.

§ 4. 3. Σημωτική

THIRDLY, The third branch may be called Σημωτική, or the doctrine of signs, the most usual whereof being words, it is aptly enough termed also Λογική, *logic*; the business whereof, is to consider the nature of signs the mind makes use of for the understanding of things, or conveying its knowledge to others. For since the things the mind contemplates, are none of them, besides itself, present to the understanding, it is necessary that something else, as a sign or representation of the thing it considers, should be present to it: and these are *ideas*. And because the scene of *ideas*, that makes one man's thoughts, cannot be laid open to the immediate view of another, nor laid up any where but in the memory, a no very sure repository: therefore to communicate our thoughts to one another, as well as record them for our own use, signs of our *ideas* are also necessary. Those which men have found most convenient, and therefore generally make use of, are articulate sounds. The consideration then of *ideas* and words, as the great instruments of knowledge, makes no despicable part of their contemplation, who would take a view of human knowledge in the whole extent of it. And perhaps if they were distinctly weighed, and duly considered, they would afford us another sort of logic and critic, than what we have been hitherto acquainted with.

§ 5. This is the first Division of the Objects of Knowledge.

THIS seems to me the first and most general, as well as na-

tural division of the objects of our understanding. For a man can employ his thoughts about nothing, but either the contemplation of *things* themselves for the discovery of truth; or about the things in his own power, which are his own *actions*; for the attainment of his own ends; or the *signs* the mind makes use of, both in the one and the other, and the right ordering of them for its clearer information. All which three, *viz. things* as they are in themselves knowable; *actions* as they depend on us, in order to happiness; and the right use of *signs* in order to knowledge, being *toto caelo* different, they seemed to me to be the three great provinces of the intellectual world, wholly separate and distinct one from another.

K 5

THE first thing that strikes the eye is the
immense length of the river, which
extends from the north to the south
of the country, and is the source of
the great river, which flows into the
sea. The river is the life of the
country, and the people of the
country are dependent on it for
their food and clothing. The river
is the life of the country, and the
people of the country are dependent
on it for their food and clothing.
The river is the life of the country,
and the people of the country are
dependent on it for their food and
clothing. The river is the life of the
country, and the people of the
country are dependent on it for their
food and clothing. The river is the
life of the country, and the people
of the country are dependent on it
for their food and clothing. The river
is the life of the country, and the
people of the country are dependent
on it for their food and clothing.

OF THE
CONDUCT OF THE UNDERSTANDING.

Quid tam temerarium tamque indignum sapientis gravitate atque constantia, quam aut falsum sentire, aut quod non satis explore perceptum sit et cognitum sine ulla dubitatione defendere? Cic. de Natura Deorum, lib. 1.

§ 1. *Introduction.*

THE last resort a man has recourse to in the conduct of himself, is his understanding: for though we distinguish the faculties of the mind, and give the supreme command to the will, as to an agent; yet the truth is, the man which is the agent determines himself to this or that voluntary action, upon some precedent knowledge, or appearance of knowledge in the understanding. No man ever sets himself about any thing but upon some view or other, which serves him for a reason for what he does: And whatsoever faculties he employs, the understanding with such light as it has, well or ill informed, constantly leads; and by that light, true or false, all his operative powers are directed. The will itself, how absolute and uncontrollable soever it may be thought, never fails in its obedience to the dictates of the understanding. Temples have their sacred images, and we see what influence they have always had over a great part of mankind. But in truth, the ideas and images in mens minds are the invisible powers that constantly govern them; and to these they all universally pay a ready submission. It is therefore of the highest concernment, that great care should be taken of the understanding, to conduct it right in the search of knowledge, and in the judgments it makes.

The logic now in use has so long possessed the chair, as the only art taught in the schools for the direction of the mind in the study of the arts and sciences, that it would perhaps be thought an affectation of novelty to suspect, that rules, that have served the learned world these two or three thousand years, and which without any complaint of defects the learned have rested in, are not sufficient to guide the understanding. And I should not doubt but this attempt would be censured as vanity or presumption, did not the great Lord Verulam's authority justify it: who, not servilely thinking learning could not be advanced beyond what it was, because for many ages it had not been, did not rest in the lazy approbation and applause of what was, because it was; but enlarged his mind to what might be. In his preface to his *Novum Organum* concerning logic, he pronounces thus: *Qui summas dialecticæ partes tribuerunt, atque inde fidissima scientiis præsidia comparari putarunt, verissime et optime viderunt intellectum humanum sibi permissum merito suspectum esse debere. Verum infirmior omnino est mala medicina; nec ipsa mali experts. Siquidem dialecticæ, quæ recepta est, licet ad civilia et artes, quæ in sermone et opinione posita sunt, rectissime adhibeatur; naturæ tamen subtilitatem longo intervallo non attingit, et prensando quod non capit, ad errores potius stabiliendos et quasi figendos, quam ad viam veritatis aperiendam valuit.*

“ They, says he, who attributed so much to logic, perceived very well and truly, that it was not safe to trust the understanding to itself, without the guard of any rules. But the remedy reached not the evil, but became a part of it: For the logic which took place, though it might do well enough in civil affairs, and the arts which consisted in talk and opinion; yet comes very far short of subtilty in the real performances of nature, and catching at what it cannot reach, has served to confirm and establish errors, rather than to open a way to truth.” And therefore a little after he says, “ That it is absolutely necessary that a better and perfecter use and employment of the mind and understanding should be introduced.” Ne-

cessario requiritur ut melior et perfectior mentis et intellectus humani usus et adoperatio introducatur.

§ 2. *Parts.*

THERE is, it is visible, great variety in mens understandings, and their natural constitutions put so wide a difference between some men in this respect, that art and industry would never be able to master; and their very natures seem to want a foundation to raise on it that which other men easily attain unto——Amongst men of equal education there is great inequality of parts. And the woods of America, as well as the schools of Athens, produce men of several abilities in the same kind. Though this be so, yet I imagine most men come very short of what they might attain unto in their several degrees by a neglect of their understandings. A few rules of logic are thought sufficient in this case for those who pretend to the highest improvement; whereas, I think there are a great many natural defects in the understanding capable of amendment, which are overlooked and wholly neglected. And it is easy to perceive that men are guilty of a great many faults in the exercise and improvement of this faculty of the mind, which hinder them in their progress, and keep them in ignorance and error all their lives. Some of them I shall take notice of, and endeavour to point out proper remedies for, in the following discourse.

§ 3. *Reasoning.*

BESIDES the want of determined ideas, and of sagacity, and exercise in finding out, and laying in order intermediate ideas, there are three miscarriages that men are guilty of in reference to their reason, whereby this faculty is hindered in them from that service it might do and was designed for. And he that reflects upon the actions and discourses of mankind, will find their defects in this kind very frequent, and very observable.

1. The first is of those who seldom reason at all, but do and think according to the example of others, whether parents, neighbours, ministers, or who else they are pleased to make choice of to have an implicit faith in, for

the saving of themselves the pains and trouble of thinking and examining for themselves.

2. The second is of those who put passion in the place of reason, and being resolved that shall govern their actions and arguments, neither use their own, nor hearken to other people's reason, any farther than it suits their humour, interest, or party; and these one may observe commonly content themselves with words which have no distinct ideas to them, though, in other matters that they come with an unbiassed indifferency to, they want not abilities to talk and hear reason, where they have no secret inclination that hinders them from being tractable to it.

3. The third sort is of those who readily and sincerely follow reason, but for want of having that which one may call *large, sound, round about sense*, have not a full view of all that relates to the question, and may be of moment to decide it. We are all short-sighted, and very often see but one side of a matter; our views are not extended to all that has a connection with it. From this defect I think no man is free. We see but in part, and we know but in part, and therefore it is no wonder we conclude not right from our partial views. This might instruct the proudest esteemer of his own parts how useful it is to talk and consult with others, even such as come short of him in capacity, quickness and penetration: For since no one sees all, and we generally have different prospects of the same thing, according to our different, as I may say, positions to it, it is not incongruous to think, nor beneath any man to try, whether another may not have notions of things which have escaped him, and which his reason would make use of if they came into his mind. The faculty of reasoning seldom or never deceives those who trust to it; its consequences from what it builds on are evident and certain, but that which it ofteneft, if not only, misleads us in, is, that the principles from which we conclude, the grounds upon which we bottom our reasoning, are but a part, something is left out which should go into the reckoning to make it just and exact. Here we may

imagine a vast and almost infinite advantage that angels and separate spirits may have over us; who, in their several degrees of elevation above us, may be endowed with more comprehensive faculties, and some of them perhaps have perfect and exact views of all finite beings that come under their consideration, can as it were, in the twinkling of an eye, collect together all their scattered and almost boundless relations. A mind so furnished, what reason has it to acquiesce in the certainty of its conclusions!

In this we may see the reason why some men of study and thought, that reason right, and are lovers of truth, do make no great advances in their discoveries of it. Error and truth are uncertainly blended in their minds; their decisions are lame and defective, and they are very often mistaken in their judgments: The reason whereof is, they converse but with one sort of men, they read but one sort of books, they will not come in the hearing but of one sort of notions; the truth is, they canton out to themselves a little *Gosben* in the intellectual world, where light shines, and, as they conclude, day blesses them; but the rest of that vast *expansum* they give up to night and darkness, and so avoid coming near it. They have a pretty traffic with known correspondents in some little creek, within that they confine themselves, and are dexterous managers enough of the wares and products of that corner with which they content themselves, but will not venture out into the great ocean of knowledge, to survey the riches that nature hath stored other parts with, no less genuine, no less solid, no less useful, than what was fallen to their lot in the admired plenty and sufficiency of their own little spot, which to them contains whatsoever is good in the universe. Those who live thus mew'd up within their own contracted territories, and will not look abroad beyond the boundaries that chance, conceit, or laziness has set to their inquiries, but live separate from the notions, discourses, and attainments of the rest of mankind, may not amiss be represented by the inhabitants of the *Marian* islands; who being separated by a large tract of sea from all

communion with the heritable parts of the earth, thought themselves the only people of the world. And though the straitness of the conveniences of life amongst them had never reached so far as to the use of fire, till the *Spaniards*, not many years since, in their voyages from *Acapulco* to *Manilia*, brought it amongst them; yet in the want and ignorance of almost all things, they looked upon themselves, even after that the *Spaniards* had brought amongst them the notice of variety of nations abounding in sciences, arts, and conveniences of life, of which they knew nothing, they looked upon themselves, I say, as the happiest and wisest people of the universe. But for all that, nobody, I think, will imagine them deep naturalists, or solid metaphysicians; nobody will deem the quickest-sighted amongst them to have very enlarged views in ethics or politics, nor can any one allow the most capable amongst them to be advanced so far in his understanding, as to have any other knowledge but of the few little things of his and the neighbouring islands within his commerce; but far enough from that comprehensive enlargement of mind which adorns a soul devoted to truth, assisted with letters, and a free generation of the several views and sentiments of thinking men of all sides. Let not men, therefore, that would have a sight of what every one pretends to be desirous to have a sight of, truth in its full extent, narrow and blind their own prospect. Let not men think there is no truth but in the sciences that they study, or the books that they read. To prejudge other mens notions before we have looked into them, is not to show their darkness, but to put out our own eyes. *Try all things, hold fast that which is good*, is a divine rule, coming from the Father of light and truth; and it is hard to know what other way men can come at truth, to lay hold of it, if they do not dig and search for it as for gold and hid treasure: but he that does so must have much earth and rubbish before he gets the pure metal; sand, and pebbles, and dross usually lie blended with it, but the gold is nevertheless gold, and will en-

rich the man that employs his pains to seek and separate it. Neither is there any danger he should be deceived by the mixture. Every man carries about him a touchstone, if he will make use of it, to distinguish substantial gold from superficial glitterings, truth from appearances. And indeed the use and benefit of this touchstone, which is natural reason, is spoiled and lost only by assumed prejudices, over-weening presumption, and narrowing our minds. The want of exercising it in the full extent of things intelligible, is that which weakens and extinguishes this noble faculty in us. Trace it, and see whether it be not so. The day-labourer in a country-village has commonly but a small pittance of knowledge, because his ideas and notions have been confined to the narrow bounds of a poor conversation and employment: the low mechanic of a country-town does somewhat outdo him; porters and cobblers of great cities surpass them. A country-gentleman, who leaving Latin and learning in the university, removes thence to his mansion-house, and associates with neighbours of the same strain, who relish nothing but hunting and a bottle; with those alone he spends his time, with these alone he converses, and can away with no company whose discourse goes beyond what claret, and dissoluteness inspires. Such a patriot formed in this happy way of improvement, cannot fail, as we see, to give notable decisions upon the bench at quarter-sessions, and eminent proofs of his skill in politics, when the strength of his purse and party have advanced him to a more conspicuous station. To such a one truly an ordinary coffee-house gleaner of the city is an errant statesman, and as much superior too, as a man, conversant about *Whitehall* and the court, is to an ordinary shop-keeper. To carry this a little farther. Here is one muffled up in the zeal and infallibility of his own sect, and will not touch a book, or enter into debate with a person that will question any of those things which to him are sacred. Another surveys our differences in religion with an equitable and fair indifference, and so finds probably that none of them are in every thing unexceptionable. These divisions and systems

were made by men, and carry the mark of fallible on them; and in those whom he differs from, and till he opened his eyes had a general prejudice against, he meets with more to be said for a great many things than before he was aware of, or could have imagined. Which of these two now is most likely to judge right in our religious controversies, and to be more stored with truth, the mark all pretend to aim at? All these men that I have instanced in, thus unequally furnished with truth, and advanced in knowledge, I suppose of equal natural parts; all the odds between them has been the different scope that has been given to their understandings to range in, for the gathering up of information, and furnishing their heads with ideas, notions and observations, whereon to employ their minds, and form their understandings.

It will possibly be objected, who is sufficient for all this? I answer, more than can be imagined. Every one knows what his proper business is, and what, according to the character he makes of himself, the world may justly expect of him; and to answer that, he will find he will have time and opportunity enough to furnish himself, if he will not deprive himself, by a narrowness of spirit, of those helps that are at hand. I do not say to be a good geographer that a man should visit every mountain, river, promontory and creek upon the face of the earth, view the buildings, and survey the land every where, as if he were going to make a purchase: but yet every one must allow that he shall know a country better that makes often sallies into it, and traverses it up and down, than he that like a mill-horse goes still round in the same track, or keeps within the narrow bounds of a field or two that delight him. He that will inquire out the best books in every science, and inform himself of the most material authors of the several sects of philosophy and religion, will not find it an infinite work to acquaint himself with the sentiments of mankind concerning the most weighty and comprehensive subjects. Let him exercise the freedom of his reason and understanding in such a latitude as this, and his mind will be

strengthened, his capacity enlarged, his faculties improved; and the light, which the remote and scattered parts of truth will give to one another, will so assist his judgment, that he will seldom be widely out, or misgiving proof of a clear head, and a comprehensive knowledge. At least, this is the only way I know to give the understanding its due improvement to the full extent of its capacity, and to distinguish the two most different things I know in the world, a logical chicaner from a man of reason. Only he that would thus give the mind its flight, and send abroad his inquiries into all parts after truth, must be sure to settle in his head determined ideas of all that he employs his thoughts about, and never fail to judge himself, and judge unbiassedly of all that he receives from others, either in their writings or discourses. Reverence or prejudice must not be suffered to give beauty or deformity to any of their opinions.

§ 4. *Of Practice and Habits.*

WE are born with faculties and powers capable almost of any thing, such at least as would carry us farther than can easily be imagined: but it is only the exercise of those powers which gives us ability and skill in any thing, and leads us towards perfection.

A middled-aged ploughman will scarce ever be brought to the carriage and language of a gentleman, though his body be as well proportioned, and his joints as supple, and his natural parts not any way inferior. The legs of a dancing-master, and the fingers of a musician, fall as it were naturally without thought or pains into regular and admirable motions. Bid them change their parts, and they will in vain endeavour to produce like motions in the members not used to them, and it will require length of time and long practice to attain but some degrees of a like ability. What incredible and astonishing actions do we find rope-dancers and tumblers bring their bodies to! Not but that fundry in almost all manual arts are as wonderful; but I name those which the world takes notice of for such, because on that very account, they give money to see them. All these admired motions, beyond the reach and almost the

conception of unpractised spectators, are nothing but the mere effects of use and industry in men, whose bodies have nothing peculiar in them from those of the amazed lookers on.

As it is in the body, so it is in the mind; practice makes it what it is, and most, even of those excellencies which are looked on as natural endowments, will be found, when examined into more narrowly, to be the product of exercise, and to be raised to that pitch only by repeated actions. Some men are remarked for pleasantness in raillery; others for apologues and apposite diverting stories. This is apt to be taken for the effect of pure nature, and that the rather, because it is not got by rules, and those who excel in either of them, never purposely set themselves to the study of it as an art to be learned. But yet it is true, that at first some lucky hit which took with somebody and gained him commendation, encouraged him to try again, inclined his thoughts and endeavours that way, till at last he insensibly got a facility in it without perceiving how, and that is attributed wholly to nature, which was much more the effect of use and practice. I do not deny that natural disposition may often give the first rise to it, but that never carries a man far without use and exercise, and it is practice alone that brings the powers of the mind as well as those of the body to their perfection. Many a good poetic vein is buried under a trade, and never produces any thing for want of improvement. We see the ways of discourse and reasoning are very different, even concerning the same matter, at court and in the university. And he that will go but from *Westminster-hall*, to the *Exchange*, will find a different genius and turn in their ways of talking, and yet one cannot think that all, whose lot fell in the city, were born with different parts from those who were bred at the university or inns of court.

To what purpose all this, but to show that the difference, so observable in mens understandings and parts, does not arise so much from their natural faculties as acquired habits. He would be laughed at that should go

about to make a fine dancer out of a country hedger, at past fifty. And he will not have much better success, who shall endeavour at that age to make a man reason well, or speak handsomely who has never been used to it, though you should lay before him a collection of all the best precepts of logic or oratory. Nobody is made any thing by hearing of rules, or laying them up in his memory; practice must settle the habit of doing without reflecting on the rule, and you may as well hope to make a good painter or musician extempore by a lecture and instruction in the arts of music and painting, as a coherent thinker, or strict reasoner, by a set of rules, showing him wherein right reasoning consists.

This being so, that defects and weakness in mens understandings, as well as other faculties, come from want of a right use of their own minds; I am apt to think the fault is generally mislaid upon nature, and there is often a complaint of want of parts, when the fault lies in want of a due improvement of them. We see men frequently dexterous and sharp enough in making a bargain, who, if you reason with them about matters of religion, appear perfectly stupid.

§ 5. *Ideas.*

I WILL not here, in what relates to the right conduct and improvement of the understanding, repeat again the getting clear and determined *ideas*, and the employing our thoughts rather about them than about sounds put for them, nor of settling the signification of words which we use with ourselves in the search of truth, or with others in discoursing about it. Those hindrances of our understandings in the pursuit of knowledge, I have sufficiently enlarged upon in another place; so that nothing more needs here to be said of those matters.

§ 6. *Principles.*

THERE is another fault that stops or misleads men in their knowledge, which I have also spoken something of, but yet is necessary to mention here again, that we may examine it to the bottom, and see the root it springs from, and that is a custom of taking up with principles that are not self-evident, and very often not so much as

true. It is not unusual to see men rest their opinions upon foundations that have no more certainty and solidity than the propositions built on them, and embraced for their sake. Such foundations are these and the like, *viz.* The founders or leaders of my party are good men, and therefore their tenets are true; it is the opinion of a sect that is erroneous, therefore it is false: it hath been long received in the world, therefore it is true; or it is new, and therefore false.

These, and many the like, which are by no means the measures of truth and falsehood, the generality of men make the standards by which they accustom their understanding to judge. And thus they falling into a habit of determining truth and falsehood by such wrong measures, it is no wonder they should embrace error for certainty, and be very positive in things they have no ground for.

There is not any, who pretends to the least reason, but, when any of these his false maxims are brought to the test, must acknowledge them to be fallible, and such as he will not allow in those that differ from him; and yet after he is convinced of this, you shall see him go on in the use of them, and the very next occasion that offers, argue again upon the same grounds. Would one not be ready to think that men are willing to impose upon themselves, and mislead their own understandings, who conduct them by such wrong measures, even after they see they cannot be relied on? But yet they will not appear so blameable as may be thought at first sight; for I think there are a great many that argue thus in earnest, and do it not to impose on themselves or others. They are persuaded of what they say, and think there is weight in it, though in a like case they have been convinced there is none; but men would be intolerable to themselves, and contemptible to others, if they should embrace opinions without any ground, and hold what they could give no manner of reason for. True or false, solid or sandy, the mind must have some foundation to rest itself upon, and, as I have remarked in another place, it no sooner entertains any proposition, but it presently

hastens to some hypothesis to bottom it on, till then it is unquiet and unsettled. So much do our own very tempers dispose us to a right use of our understandings, if we would follow as we should the inclinations of our nature.

In some matters of concernment, especially those of religion, men are not permitted to be always wavering and uncertain, they must embrace and profess some tenets or other: and it would be a shame, nay a contradiction too heavy for any one's mind to lie constantly under, for him to pretend seriously to be persuaded of the truth of any religion, and yet not to be able to give any reason of his belief, or to say any thing for his preference of this to any other opinion; and therefore they must make use of some principles or other, and those can be no other than such as they have and can manage; and to say they are not in earnest persuaded by them, and do not rest upon those they make use of, is contrary to experience, and to allege that they are not misled when we complain they are.

If this be so, it will be urged, why then do they not make use of sure and unquestionable principles, than rest on such grounds as may deceive them, and will, as is visible, serve to support error as well as truth?

To this I answer, the reason why they do not make use of better and surer principles, is because they cannot: But this inability proceeds not from want of natural parts (for those few whose case that is are to be excused), but for want of use and exercise. Few men are from their youth accustomed to strict reasoning, and to trace the dependence of any truth in a long train of consequences to its remote principles, and to observe its connection; and he that by frequent practice has not been used to this employment of his understanding, it is no more wonder that he should not, when he is grown into years, be able to bring his mind to it, than that he should not be on a sudden able to grave or design, dance on the ropes, or write a good hand, who has never practised either of them.

Nay, the most of men are so wholly strangers to this, that they do not so much as perceive their want of it; they dispatch the ordinary business of their callings by rote, as we say, as they have learned it, and if at any time they miss success, they impute it to any thing rather than want of thought or skill, that they conclude (because they know no better) they have in perfection; or if there be any subject that interest or fancy has recommended to their thoughts, their reasoning about it is still after their own fashion, be it better or worse, it serves their turns, and is the best they are acquainted with; and therefore when they are led by it into mistakes, and their business succeeds accordingly, they impute it to any cross accident, or default of others, rather than to their own want of understanding; that is, what nobody discovers or complains of in himself. Whatsoever made his business to miscarry, it was not of right thought and judgment in himself: He sees no such defect in himself, but is satisfied that he carries on his designs well enough by his own reasoning, or at least should have done, had it not been for unlucky traverses not in his power. Thus being content with this short and very imperfect use of his understanding, he never troubles himself to seek out methods of improving his mind, and lives all his life without any notion of close reasoning, in a continued connection of a long train of consequences from sure foundations, such as is requisite for the making out, and clearing most of the speculative truths most men own to believe and are most concerned in. Not to mention here what I shall have occasion to insist on by and by more fully, *viz.* that in many cases it is not one series of consequences will serve the turn, but many different and opposite deductions must be examined and laid together, before a man can come to make a right judgment of the point in question. What then can be expected from men that neither see the want of any such kind of reasoning as this; nor if they do, know they how to set about it, or could perform it? You may as well set a country man, who scarce knows the figures,

and never cast up a sum of three particulars, to state a merchants long account, and find the true balance of it.

What then should be done in this case? I answer, we should always remember what I said above, that the faculties of our souls are improved and made useful to us, just after the same manner as our bodies are. Would you have a man write or paint, dance or fence well, or perform any other manual operation dexterously and with ease; let him have ever so much vigour and activity, suppleness and address naturally, yet nobody expects this from him unless he has been used to it, and has employed time and pains in fashioning and forming his hand or outward parts to these motions. Just so it is in the mind; would you have a man reason well, you must use him to it by times, exercise his mind in observing the connection of ideas, and follow them in train. Nothing does this better than mathematics, which therefore, I think, should be taught all those who have the time and opportunity, not so much to make them mathematicians, as to make them reasonable creatures; for though we all call ourselves so, because we are born to it if we please; yet we may truly say Nature gives us but the seeds of it; we are born to be, if we please, rational creatures, but it is use and exercise only that makes us so, and we are indeed so no farther than industry and application has carried us. And therefore in ways of reasoning which men have not been used to, he that will observe the conclusions they take up, must be satisfied they are not all rational.

This has been the less taken notice of, because every one in his private affairs, uses some sort of reasoning or other, enough to denominate him reasonable. But the mistake is, that he that is found reasonable in one thing, is concluded to be so in all, and to think or say otherwise, is thought so unjust an affront, and so senseless a censure, that nobody ventures to do it. It looks like the degradation of a man below the dig-

nity of his nature. It is true, that he that reasons well in any one thing, has a mind naturally capable of reasoning well in others, and to the same degree of strength and clearness, and possibly much greater, had his understanding been so employed. But it is as true, that he who can reason well to-day about one sort of matters, cannot at all reason to-day about others, though perhaps a year hence he may. But wherever a man's rational faculty fails him, and will not serve him to reason, there we cannot say he is rational, how capable soever he may be by time and exercise to become so.

Try in men of low and mean education, who have never elevated their thoughts above the spade and the plough, nor looked beyond the ordinary drudgery of a day labourer. Take thoughts of such an one, used for many years to one track, out of that narrow compass he has been all his life confined to, you will find him no more capable of reasoning than almost a perfect natural. Some one or two rules, on which their conclusions immediately depend, you will find in most men have governed all their thoughts; these, true or false, have been the maxims they have been guided by: Take these from them, and they are perfectly at a loss, their compass and pole-star then are gone, and their understanding is perfectly at a nonplus, and therefore they either immediately return to their old maxims again as the foundations of all truth to them, notwithstanding all that can be said to show their weakness; or if they give them up to their reasons, they with them give up all truth and further inquiry, and think there is no such thing as certainty. For if you would enlarge their thoughts, and settle them upon more remote and surer principles, they either cannot easily apprehend them, or if they can, know not what use to make of them; for long deductions from remote principles, is what they have not been used to, and cannot manage.

What then, can grown men never be improved or enlarged in their understandings? I say not so, but

this I think I may say, that it will not be done without industry and application, which will require more time and pains than grown men, settled in their course of life, will allow to it, and therefore very seldom is done. And this very capacity of attaining it by use and exercise only, brings us back to that which I laid down before, that it is only practice that improves our minds as well as bodies, and we must expect nothing from our understandings any farther than they are perfected by habits.

The Americans are not all born with worse understandings than the Europeans, though we see none of them have such reaches in the arts and sciences. And among the children of a poor country-man, the lucky chance of education, and getting into the world, gives one infinitely the superiority in parts over the rest, who continuing at home, had continued also just of the same size with his brethren.

He that has to do with young scholars, especially in mathematics, may perceive how their minds open by degrees, and how it is exercise alone that opens them. Sometimes they will stick a long time at a part of a demonstration, not for want of will and application, but really for want of perceiving the connection of two ideas; that to one whose understanding is more exercised, is as visible as any thing can be. The same would be with a grown man beginning to study mathematics; the understanding, for want of use, often sticks in very plain way, and he himself that is so puzzled, when he comes to see the connection, wonders what it was he stuck at in a case so plain.

§ 7. *Mathematics.*

I HAVE mentioned *mathematics* as a way to settle in the mind an habit of reasoning closely and in train; not that I think it necessary that all men should be deep mathematicians, but that having got the way of reasoning, which that study necessarily brings the mind to, they might be able to transfer it to other parts of knowledge as they should have occasion. For in all sorts of reasoning, every single ar-

gument should be managed as a mathematical demonstration, the connection and dependence of ideas should be followed till the mind is brought to the source on which it bottoms, and observes the coherence all along, though in proofs of probability, one such train is not enough to settle the judgment as in demonstrative knowledge.

Where a truth is made out by one demonstration, there needs no farther inquiry; but in probabilities where there wants demonstration to establish the truth beyond doubt, there it is not enough to trace one argument to its source, and observe its strength and weakness, but all the arguments, after having been so examined on both sides, must be laid in balance one against another, and upon the whole the understanding determine its assent.

This is a way of reasoning the understanding should be accustomed to, which is so different from what the illiterate are used to, that even learned men oftentimes seem to have very little or no notion of it. Nor is it to be wondered, since the way of disputing in the schools leads them quite away from it, by insisting on one topical argument, by the success of which the truth or falsehood of the question is to be determined, and victory adjudged to the opponent or defendant; which is all one as if one should balance an account by one sum charged and discharged, when there are an hundred others to be taken into consideration.

This, therefore, it would be well if mens minds were accustomed to, and that early, that they might not erect their opinions upon one single view, when so many other are requisite to make up the account, and must come into the reckoning before a man can form a right judgment. This would enlarge their minds, and give a due freedom to their understandings, that they might not be led into error by presumption, laziness or precipitancy; for I think nobody can approve such a conduct of the understanding, as should mislead it from truth, though it be ever so much in fashion to make use of it.

To this perhaps it will be objected, that to manage the understanding as I propose, would require every man to be a scholar, and to be furnished with all the materials of knowledge, and exercised in all the ways of reasoning. To which I answer, that it is a shame for those that have time, and the means to attain knowledge, to want any helps or assistance for the improvement of their understandings that are to be got, and to such I would be thought here chiefly to speak. Those methinks, who by the industry and parts of their ancestors, have been set free from a constant drudgery to their backs and their bellies, should bestow some of their spare time on their heads, and open their minds, by some trials and essays in all the sorts and matters of reasoning. I have before mentioned *mathematics*, wherein *algebra* gives new helps and views to the understanding. If I propose these, it is not, as I said, to make every man a thorough mathematician, or a deep algebraist; but yet I think the study of them is of infinite use even to grown men; first by experimentally convincing them, that to make any one reason well, it is not enough to have parts wherewith he is satisfied, and that serve him well enough in his ordinary course. A man in those studies will see, that however good he may think his understanding, yet in many things, and those very visible, it may fail him. This would take off that presumption that most men have of themselves in this part; and they would not be so apt to think their minds wanted no helps to enlarge them, that there could be nothing added to the acuteness and penetration of their understandings.

Secondly, The study of *mathematics* would show them the necessity there is, in reasoning, to separate all the distinct ideas, and see the habitudes that all those concerned in the present inquiry have to one another, and to lay by those which relate not to the proposition in hand, and wholly to leave them out of the reckoning. This is that, which in other subjects besides quantity, is what is absolutely requisite to just

reasoning, though in them it is not so easily observed nor so carefully practised. In those parts of knowledge where it is thought demonstration has nothing to do, men reason as it were in the lump; and if, upon a summary and confused view, or upon a partial consideration, they can raise the appearance of a probability, they usually rest content; especially if it be in a dispute where every little straw is laid hold on, and every thing that can but be drawn in any way to give colour to the argument, is advanced with ostentation. But that mind is not in a posture to find the truth that does not distinctly take all the parts asunder, and, omitting what is not all to the point, draw a conclusion from the result of all the particulars which any way influence it. There is another no less useful habit to be got by an application to mathematical demonstrations, and that is of using the mind to a long train of consequences; but having mentioned that already, I shall not again here repeat it.

As to men whose fortunes and time is narrower, what may suffice them is not of that vast extent as may be imagined, and so comes not within the objection.

Nobody is under an obligation to know every thing. Knowledge and science in general, is the business only of those who are at ease and leisure. Those who have particular callings ought to understand them; and it is no unreasonable proposal, nor impossible to be compassed, that they should think and reason right about what is their daily employment. This one cannot think them incapable of, without levelling them with the brutes, and charging them with a stupidity below the rank of rational creatures.

§ 8. *Religion.*

BESIDES his particular calling for the support of this life, every one has a concern in a future life, which he is bound to look after. This engages his thoughts in religion; and here it mightily lies upon him to understand and reason right. Men therefore cannot be excused from understanding the words, and framing the general notions relating to religion right. The

one day of seven, besides other days of rest, allows in the Christian world time enough for this (had they no other idle hours), if they would but make use of these vacancies from their daily labour, and apply themselves to an improvement of knowledge, with as much diligence as they often do to a great many other things that are useless, and had but those that would enter them according to their several capacities in a right way to this knowledge. The original make of their minds is like that of other men, and they would be found not to want understanding fit to receive the knowledge of *religion*, if they were a little encouraged and helped in it as they should be. For there are instances of very mean people, who have raised their minds to a great sense and understanding of *religion*: and though these have not been so frequent as could be wished; yet they are enough to clear that condition of life from a necessity of gross ignorance, and to show that more might be brought to be rational creatures and Christians (for they can hardly be thought really to be so, who, wearing the name, know not so much as the very principles of that religion), if due care were taken of them. For, if I mistake not, the peasantry lately in *France* (a rank of people under a much heavier pressure of want and poverty than the day-labourers in *England*) of the reformed *religion*, understood it much better, and could say more for it, than those of a higher condition among us.

But if it shall be concluded that the meaner sort of people must give themselves up to a brutish stupidity in the things of their nearest concernment, which I see no reason for, this excuses not those of a freer fortune and education, if they neglect their understandings, and take no care to employ them as they ought, and set them right in the knowledge of those things, for which principally they were given them. At least those, whose plentiful fortunes allow them the opportunities and helps of improvements, are not so few, but that it might be hoped great advancements might be made in knowledge of all kinds, especially in that

of the greatest concern and largest views, if men would make a right use of their faculties, and study their own understandings.

§ 9. *Ideas.*

OUTWARD corporeal objects, that constantly importune our senses, and captivate our appetites, fail not to fill our heads with lively and lasting *ideas* of that kind. Here the mind needs not be set upon getting greater store; they offer themselves fast enough, and are usually entertained in such plenty, and lodged so carefully, that the mind wants room or attention for others that it has more use and need of. To fit the understanding therefore for such reasoning as I have been above speaking of, care should be taken to fill it with moral and more abstract *ideas*; for these not offering themselves to the senses, but being to be framed to the understanding, people are generally so neglectful of a faculty they are apt to think wants nothing, that I fear most mens minds are more unfurnished with such *ideas* than is imagined. They often use the words, and how can they be suspected to want the *ideas*? What I have said in the third book of my Essay, will excuse me from any other answer to this question. But to convince people of what moment it is to their understandings, to be furnished with such abstract *ideas* steady and settled in them, give me leave to ask how any one shall be able to know, whether he be obliged to be just, if he has not established *ideas* in his mind, of obligation and of justice, since knowledge consists in nothing but the perceived agreement or disagreement of those *ideas*? and so of all others the like, which concern our lives and manners. And if men do find a difficulty to see the agreement or disagreement of two angles which lie before their eyes, unalterable in a diagram, how utterly impossible will it be to perceive it in *ideas* that have no other sensible objects to represent them to the mind, but sounds, with which they have no manner of conformity, and therefore had need to be clearly settled in the mind themselves, if we would make any clear judgment

about them? This therefore is one of the first things the mind should be employed about in the right conduct of the understanding, without which it is impossible it should be capable of reasoning right about those matters. But in these, and all other *ideas*, care must be taken that they harbour no inconsistencies, and that they have a real existence where real existence is supposed, and are not mere chimeras with a supposed existence.

§ 10. *Prejudice.*

EVERY one is forward to complain of the *prejudices* that mislead other men or parties, as if he were free, and had none of his own. This being objected on all sides, it is agreed, that it is a fault and an hindrance to knowledge. What now is the cure? No other but this, that every man should let alone other's *prejudices* and examine his own. Nobody is convinced of his by the accusation of another, he recriminates by the same rule and is clear. The only way to remove this great cause of ignorance and error out of the world, is, for every one impartially to examine himself. If others will not deal fairly with their own minds; does that make my errors truths, or ought it to make me in love with them, and willing to impose on myself? If others love cataracts on their eyes, should that hinder me from couching mine as soon as I could? Every one declares against blindness, and yet who almost is not fond of that which dims his sight, and keeps the clear light out of his mind, which should lead him into truth and knowledge? False or doubtful positions, relied upon as unquestionable maxims, keep those in the dark from truth who build on them. Such are usually the *prejudices* imbibed from education, party, reverence, fashion, interest, &c. This is the mote which every one sees in his brother's eye, but never regards the beam in his own. For who is there almost that is ever brought fairly to examine his own principles, and see whether they are such as will bear the trial? But yet this should be one of the first things one should set about, and be scrupu-

lous in, who would rightly conduct his understanding in the search of truth and knowledge.

To those who are willing to get rid of this great hindrance of knowledge (for to such only I write), to those who would shake off this great and dangerous impostor *prejudice*, who dresses up falsehood in the likeness of truth, and so dexterously hoodwinks mens minds, as to keep them in the dark, with a belief that they are more in the light than any that do not see with their eyes; I shall offer this one mark whereby *prejudice* may be known. He that is strongly of any opinion, must suppose (unless he be self condemned) that his persuasion is built upon good grounds; and that his assent is no greater than what the evidence of the truth he holds forces him to: and that they are arguments, and not inclination or fancy that make him so confident and positive in his tenets. Now if after all his profession, he cannot bear any opposition to his opinion, if he cannot so much as give a patient hearing, much less examine and weigh the arguments on the other side, does he not plainly confess it is *prejudice* governs him? and it is not the evidence of truth, but some lazy anticipation, some beloved presumption that he desires to rest undisturbed in. For if what he holds be, as he gives out, well fenced with evidence, and he sees it to be true, what need he fear to put it to the proof? If his opinion be settled upon a firm foundation, if the arguments that support it, and have obtained his assent, be clear, good, and convincing, why should he be shy to have it tried whether they be proof or not? He whose assent goes beyond his evidence, owes this excess of his adherence only to *prejudice*, and does in effect own it, when he refuses to hear what is offered against it; declaring thereby, that it is not evidence he seeks, but the quiet enjoyment of the opinion he is fond of, with a forward condemnation of all, that may stand in opposition to it, unheard and unexamined; which, what is it but *prejudice*? *Qui æquum statuerit parte inauditâ alterâ etiam si æquum statuerit, baud æquus fuerit.* He that

would acquit himself in this case as a lover of truth, not giving way to any preoccupation, or bias that may mislead him, must do two things that are not very common, nor very easy.

§ 11. *Indifferency.*

FIRST, he must not be in love with any opinion, or wish it to be true, till he knows it to be so, and then he will not need to wish it: for nothing that is false can deserve our good wishes, nor a desire that it should have the place and force of truth; and yet nothing is more frequent than this. Men are fond of certain tenets upon no other evidence but respect and custom, and think they must maintain them, or all is gone, though they have never examined the ground they stand on, nor have ever made them out to themselves, or can make them out to others. We should contend earnestly for the truth, but we should first be sure that it is truth, or else we fight against God, who is the God of truth, and do the work of the devil, who is the father and propagator of lies; and our zeal, though never so warm, will not excuse us; for this is plainly prejudice.

§ 12. *Examine.*

SECONDLY, He must do that which he will find himself very averse to, as judging the thing unnecessary, or himself incapable of doing it. He must try whether his principles be certainly true or not, and how far he may safely rely upon them. This whether fewer have the heart or the skill to do, I shall not determine; but this I am sure, this is that which every one ought to do, who professes to love truth, and would not impose upon himself; which is a surer way to be made a fool of than by being exposed to the sophistry of others. The disposition to put any cheat upon ourselves, works constantly, and we are pleased with it, but are impatient of being bantered or misled by others. The inability I here speak of, is not any natural defect that makes men incapable of examining their own principles. To such, rules of conducting their understandings are useless, and that

is the case of very few. The great number is of those whom the ill habit of never exerting their thoughts has disabled: the powers of their minds are starved by disuse, and have lost that reach and strength which nature fitted them to receive from exercise. Those who are in a condition to learn the first rules of plain arithmetic, and could be brought to cast up an ordinary sum, are capable of this, if they had but accustomed their minds to reasoning: but they that have wholly neglected the exercise of their understandings in this way, will be very far at first from being able to do it, and as unfit for it as one unpractised in figures to cast up a shop-book, and perhaps think it as strange to be set about it. And yet it must nevertheless be confessed to be a wrong use of our understandings, to build our tenets (in things where we are concerned to hold the truth) upon principles that may lead us into error. We take our principles at hap-hazard upon trust, and without ever having examined them, and then believe a whole system, upon a presumption that they are true and solid; and what is all this but childish, shameful, senseless credulity?

In these two things, *viz.* an equal indifferency for all truth; I mean the receiving it in the love of it as truth, but not loving it for any other reason before we know it to be true; and in the examination of our principles, and not receiving any for such, nor building on them till we are fully convinced, as rational creatures, of their solidity, truth and certainty, consists that freedom of the understanding, which is necessary to a rational creature, and without which it is not truly an understanding. It is conceit, fancy, extravagance, any thing rather than understanding, if it must be under the constraint of receiving and holding opinions by the authority of any thing but their own, not fancied, but perceived, evidence. This was rightly called imposition, and is of all other the worst and most dangerous sort of it. For we impose upon ourselves, which is the strongest imposition of all others; and we impose upon ourselves in that part

which ought with the greatest care to be kept free from all imposition. The world is apt to cast great blame on those who have an indifferency for opinions, especially in religion. I fear this is the foundation of great error and worse consequences. To be indifferent which of two opinions is true, is the right temper of the mind that preserves it from being imposed on, and disposes it to examine with that indifferency, till it has done its best to find the truth, and this is the only direct and safe way to it. But to be indifferent whether we embrace falsehood or truth or no, is the great road to error. Those who are not indifferent which opinion is true, are guilty of this, they suppose, without examining, that what they hold is true, and then think they ought to be zealous for it. Those, it is plain by their warmth and eagerness, are not indifferent for their own opinions, but methinks are very indifferent whether they be true or false, since they cannot endure to have any doubts raised, or objections made against them; and it is visible they never have made any themselves, and so never having examined them, know not, nor are concerned, as they should be, to know whether they be true or false.

These are the common and most general miscarriages which I think men should avoid or rectify in a right conduct of their understandings, and should be particularly taken care of in education. The business whereof in respect of knowledge is not, as I think, to perfect a learner in all or any one of the sciences, but to give his mind that freedom, that disposition, and those habits that may enable him to attain any part of knowledge he shall apply himself to, or stand in need of in the future course of his life.

This, and this only is well principling, and not the instilling a reverence and veneration for certain dogmas, under the specious title of principles, which are often so remote from that truth and evidence which belongs to principles, that they ought to be rejected as false and erroneous, and is often the cause to men so educated, when they come abroad into the world,

and find they cannot maintain the principles so taken up and rested in, to cast off all principles, and turn perfect sceptics, regardless of knowledge and virtue.

There are several weaknesses and defects in the understanding, either from the natural temper of the mind, or ill habits taken up, which hinder it in its progress to knowledge. Of these there are as many possibly to be found, if the mind were thoroughly studied, as there are diseases of the body, each whereof clogs and disables the understanding to some degree, and therefore deserves to be looked after and cured. I shall set down some few to excite men, especially those who make knowledge their business, to look in to themselves, and observe whether they do not indulge some weakness, allow some miscarriages in the management of their intellectual faculty, which is prejudicial to them in the search of truth.

§ 13. *Observation.*

PARTICULAR matters of fact are the undoubted foundations on which our civil and natural knowledge is built: the benefit the understanding makes of them is to draw from them conclusions, which may be as standing rules of knowledge, and consequently of practice. The mind often makes not that benefit it should of the information it receives from the accounts of civil or natural historians, in being too forward, or too slow in making observations on the particular facts recorded in them.

There are those who are very assiduous in reading, and yet do not much advance their knowledge by it. They are delighted with the stories that are told, and perhaps can tell them again, for they make all they read nothing but history to themselves; but not reflecting on it, not making to themselves observations from what they read, they are very little improved by all that crowd of particulars, that either pass through, or lodge themselves in their understandings. They dream on in a constant course of reading and cramping themselves, but, not digesting any thing, it produces nothing but an heap of crudities.

If their memories retain well, one may say they have the materials of knowledge, but like those for building, they are of no advantage, if there be no other use made of them but to let them lie heaped up together. Opposite to these there are others who lose the improvement they should make of matters of fact by a quite contrary conduct. They are apt to draw general conclusions, and raise axioms from every particular they may meet with. These make as little true benefit of history as the other; nay, being of forward and active spirits, receive more harm by it; it being of worse consequence to steer one's thoughts by a wrong rule, than to have none at all, error doing to busy men much more harm, than ignorance to the slow and sluggish. Between these, those seem to do best, who taking material and useful hints sometimes from single matters of fact, carry them in their minds to be judged of, by what they shall find in history to confirm or reverse these imperfect observations; which may be established into rules fit to be relied on, when they are justified by a sufficient and wary induction of particulars. He that makes no such reflections on what he reads, only loads his mind with a rhapsody of tales fit in winter-nights for the entertainment of others: and he that will improve every matter of fact into a maxim, will abound in contrary observations, that can be of no other use but to perplex and puzzle him if he compares them; or else to misguide him, if he gives himself up to the authority of that, which for its novelty, or for some other fancy, best pleases him.

§ 13. *Bias.*

NEXT to these, we may place those, who suffer their own natural tempers and passions they are possessed with to influence their judgments, especially of men and things that may any way relate to their present circumstances and interest. Truth is all simple, all pure, will bear no mixture of any thing else with it. It is rigid and inflexible to any bye interests; and so should the understanding be, whose use and excellency

Of the Conduct of the Understanding.

lies in conforming itself to it. To think of every thing just as it is in itself, is the proper business of the understanding, though it be not that which men always employ it to. This all men, at first hearing, allow is the right use every one should make of his understanding. Nobody will be at such an open defiance with common sense, as to profess that we should not endeavour to know, and think of things as they are in themselves, and yet there is nothing more frequent than to do the contrary; and men are apt to excuse themselves, and think they have reason to do so, if they have but a pretence that it is for God, or a good cause, that is, in effect for themselves, their own persuasion or party: for to those in their turns the several sects of men, especially in matters of religion, entitle God and a good cause. But God requires not men to wrong or misuse their faculties for him, nor to lie to others or themselves for his sake; which they purposely do, who will not suffer their understandings to have right conceptions of the things proposed to them, and designedly restrain themselves from having just thoughts of every thing, as far as they are concerned to inquire. And as for a good cause, that needs not such ill helps; if it be good, truth will support it, and it has no need of fallacy or falsehood.

§ 14. Arguments.

VERY much of kin to this, is the hunting after *arguments* to make good one side of a question, and wholly to neglect and refuse those which favour the other side. What is this but wilfully to misguide the understanding, and is so far from giving truth its due value, that it wholly debases it: espouse opinions that best comport with their power, profit, or credit, and then seek arguments to support them? Truth light upon this way is of no more avail to us than error; for what is so taken up by us, may be false as well as true, and he has not done his duty who has thus stumbled upon truth in his way to preferment.

There is another but more innocent way of collecting arguments, very familiar among bookish men, which is to furnish themselves with the arguments they meet with pro and con in the questions they study. This helps them not to judge right, nor argue strongly, but only to talk copiously on either side, without being steady and settled in their own judgments: for such arguments gathered from other mens thoughts, floating only in the memory, are there ready indeed to supply copious talk with some appearance of reason, but are far from helping us to judge right. Such variety of arguments only distract the understanding that relies on them, unless it has gone farther than such a superficial way of examining; this is to quit truth for appearance, only to serve our vanity. The sure and only way to get true knowledge, is to form in our minds clear settled notions of things, with names annexed to those determined ideas. These we are to consider, and with their several relations and habitudes, and not amuse ourselves with floating names, and words of indetermined signification, which we can use in several senses to serve a turn. It is in the perception of the habitudes and respects our ideas have one to another, that real knowledge consists; and when a man once perceives how far they agree or disagree one with another, he will be able to judge of what other people say, and will not need to be led by the arguments of others, which are many of them nothing but plausible sophistry. This will teach him to state the question right, and see whereon it turns; and thus he will stand upon his own legs, and know by his own understanding, whereas by collecting and learning arguments by heart, he will be but a retainer to others; and when any one questions the foundations they are built upon, he will be at a nonplus, and be fain to give up his implicit knowledge.

§ 15. *Haste.*

LABOUR for labour-sake is against nature. The understanding, as well as all the other faculties, chooses

always the shortest way to its end, would presently obtain the knowledge it is about, and then set upon some new inquiry. But this, whether laziness or haste, often misleads it, and makes it content itself with improper ways of search, and such as will not serve the turn: sometimes it rests upon testimony, when testimony of right has nothing to do, because it is easier to believe than to be scientifically instructed: sometimes it contents itself with one argument, and rests satisfied with that, as it were a demonstration; whereas the thing under proof is not capable of demonstration, and therefore must be submitted to the trial of probabilities, and all the material arguments pro and con be examined and brought to a balance. In some cases the mind is determined by probable topics in inquiries, where demonstration may be had. All these and several others, which laziness, impatience, custom, and want of use and attention lead men into, are misapplications of the understanding in the search of truth. In every question the nature and manner of the proof it is capable of should be considered, to make our inquiry such as it should be. This would save a great deal of frequently employed pains, and lead us sooner to that discovery and possession of truth we are capable of. The multiplying variety of arguments, especially frivolous ones, such as are all that are merely verbal, is not only lost labour, but cumpers the memory to no purpose, and serves only to hinder it from seizing and holding of the truth in all those cases which are capable of demonstration. In such a way of proof the truth and certainty is seen, and the mind fully possesses itself of it; when in the other way of assent, it only hovers about it, is amused with uncertainties. In this superficial way indeed the mind is capable of more variety of plausible talk, but is not enlarged as it should be in its knowledge. It is to this same haste and impatience of the mind also, that a not due tracing of the arguments to their true foundation, is owing; men see a little, presume a great deal, and so jump to the conclusion. This is a short way to fancy

and conceit, and (if firmly embraced) to opiniatrey, but is certainly the farthest way about to knowledge. For he that will know, must by the connection of the proofs see the truth, and the ground it stands on; and therefore, if he has for haste skipt over what he should have examined, he must begin and go over all again, or else he will never come to knowledge.

§ 16. *Desultory.*

ANOTHER fault of as ill consequence as this, which proceeds also from laziness with a mixture of vanity, is the skipping from one sort of knowledge to another. Some mens tempers are quickly weary of any one thing. Constancy and assiduity is what they cannot bear: the same study long continued in, is as intolerable to them, as the appearing long in the same clothes or fashion is to a court-lady.

§ 17. *Smattering.*

OTHERS, that they may seem universally knowing, get a little smattering in every thing. Both these may fill their heads with superficial notions of things, but are very much out of the way of attaining truth or knowledge.

§ 18. *Universality.*

I DO not here speak against the taking a taste of every sort of knowledge; it is certainly very useful and necessary to form the mind, but then it must be done in a different way, and to a different end. Not for talk and vanity to fill the head with shreds of all kinds, that he who is possessed of such a frippery, may be able to match the discourses of all he shall meet with, as if nothing could come amiss to him; and his head was so well stored a magazine, that nothing could be proposed which he was not master of, and was readily furnished to entertain any one on. This is an excellency indeed, and a great one too, to have a real and true knowledge in all, or most of the objects of contemplation. But it is what the mind of one and the same man can hardly attain unto; and the instances are so few of those who have in any measure approached towards it, that I know not whether they are to be proposed as examples in the ordinary con-

duct of the understanding. For a man to understand fully the business of his particular calling in the commonwealth, and of religion, which is his calling as he is a man in the world, is usually enough to take up his whole time; and there are few that inform themselves in these, which is every man's proper and peculiar business, so to the bottom as they should do. But though this be so, and there are very few men that extend their thoughts towards universal knowledge; yet I do not doubt, but if the right way were taken, and the methods of inquiry were ordered as they should be, men of little business and great leisure might go a great deal farther in it than is usually done. To return to the business in hand, the end and use of a little insight in those parts of knowledge, which are not a man's proper business, is to accustom our minds to all sorts of ideas, and the proper ways of examining their habitudes and relations. This gives the mind a freedom, and the exercising the understanding in the several ways of inquiry and reasoning, which the most skilful have made use of, teaches the mind sagacity and wariness, and a suppleness to apply itself more closely and dexterously to the bents and turns of the matter in all its researches. Besides, this universal taste of all the sciences, with an indifferency before the mind is possessed with any one in particular, and grown into love and admiration of what is made its darling, will prevent another evil very commonly to be observed in those who have from the beginning been seasoned only by one part of knowledge. Let a man be given up to the contemplation of one sort of knowledge, and that will become every thing. The mind will take such a tincture from a familiarity with that object, that every thing else, how remote soever, will be brought under the same view. A metaphysician will bring ploughing and gardening immediately to abstract notions, the history of nature shall signify nothing to him. An alchymist, on the contrary, shall reduce divinity to the maxims of his laboratory, explain morality by *sal*, *sulphur* and *mercury*, and alle-

gorize the scripture itself, and the sacred mysteries thereof into the philosopher's stone. And I heard once a man who had a more than ordinary excellency in music, seriously accommodate Moses's seven days of the first week to the notes of music, as if from thence had been taken the measure and method of the creation. It is of no small consequence to keep the mind from such a possession, which I think is best done by giving it a fair and equal view of the whole intellectual world, wherein it may see the order, rank, and beauty of the whole, and give a just allowance to the distinct provinces of the several sciences in the due order and usefulness of each of them.

If this be that which old men will not think necessary, nor be easily brought to; it is fit at least that it should be practised in the breeding of the young. The business of education, as I have already observed, is not, as I think, to make them perfect in any one of the sciences, but so to open and dispose their minds as may best make them capable of any, when they shall apply themselves to it. If men are for a long time accustomed only to one sort or method of thoughts, their minds grow stiff in it, and do not readily turn to another. It is therefore to give them this freedom that I think they should be made look into all sorts of knowledge, and exercise their understandings in so wide a variety and stock of knowledge. But I do not propose it as a variety and stock of knowledge, but a variety and freedom of thinking, as an increase of the powers and activity of the mind, not as an enlargement of its possessions.

§ 19. *Reading.*

THIS is that which I think great readers are apt to be mistaken in. Those who have read of every thing, are thought to understand every thing too; but it is not always so. Reading furnishes the mind only with materials of knowledge; it is thinking makes what we read ours. We are of the ruminating kind, and it is not enough to cram ourselves with a great load of collections; unless we chew them over again, they

will not give us strength and nourishment. There are indeed in some writers visible instances of deep thoughts, close and acute reasoning, and ideas well pursued. The light these would give would be of great use, if their reader would observe and imitate them ; all the rest at best are but particulars fit to be turned into knowledge ; but that can be done only by our own meditation, and examining the reach, force and coherence of what is said ; and then as far as we apprehend and see the connection of ideas, so far it is ours ; without that, it is but so much loose matter floating in our brain. The memory may be stored, but the judgment is little better, and the stock of knowledge not increased by being able to repeat what others have said, or produce the arguments we have found in them. Such a knowledge as this, is but knowledge by hearsay, and the ostentation of it, is at best but talking by rote, and very often upon weak and wrong principles. For all that is to be found in books, is not built upon true foundations, nor always rightly deduced from the principles it is pretended to be built on. Such an examen as is requisite to discover that, every reader's mind is not forward to make ; especially in those who have given themselves up to a party, and only hunt for what they can scrape together, that may favour and support the tenets of it. Such men wilfully exclude themselves from truth, and from all true benefit to be received by reading. Others of more indifferency often want attention and industry. The mind is backward in itself to be at the pains to trace every argument to its original, and to see upon what basis it stands, and how firmly : but yet it is this that gives so much the advantage to one man more than another in reading. The mind should, by severe rules, be tied down to this at first uneasy task ; use and exercise will give it facility. So that those who are accustomed to it, readily, as it were with one cast of the eye, take a view of the argument, and presently, in most cases, see where it bottoms. Those who have got this faculty, one may

say, have got the true key of books, and the clue to lead them, through the mizmaze of variety of opinions and authors, to truth and certainty. This young beginners should be entered in, and showed the use of, that they may profit by their reading. Those who are strangers to it, will be apt to think it too great a clog in the way of mens studies, and they will suspect they shall meet but small progress, if, in the books they read, they must stand to examine and unravel every argument, and follow it step by step up to its original.

I answer, this is a good objection, and ought to weigh with those whose reading is designed for much talk and little knowledge, and I have nothing to say to it. But I am here inquiring into the conduct of the understanding in its progress towards knowledge; and to those who aim at that, I may say, that he, who fair and softly goes steadily forward in a course that points right, will sooner be at his journey's end, than he that runs after every one he meets, though he gallop all day full-speed.

To which let me add, that this way of thinking on, and profiting by what we read, will be a clog and rub to any one only in the beginning; when custom and exercise has made it familiar, it will be dispatched in most occasions, without resting or interruption in the course of our reading. The motions and views of a mind exercised that way, are wonderfully quick; and a man used to such sort of reflections, sees as much at one glimpse as would require a long discourse to lay before another, and make out in an entire and gradual deduction. Besides, that when the first difficulties are over, the delight and sensible advantage it brings, mightily encourages and enlivens the mind in reading, which without this is very improperly called study.

§ 20. *Intermediate Principles.*

As an help to this, I think it may be proposed, that, for the saving the long progression of the thoughts to remote and first principles in every case, the mind

should provide it several stages ; that is to say, intermediate principles, which it might have recourse to in the examining those positions that come in its way. These, though they are not self-evident principles, yet if they have been made out from them by a wary and unquestionable deduction, may be depended on as certain and infallible truths, and serve as unquestionable truths to prove other points depending on them by a nearer and shorter view than remote and general maxims. These may serve as land-marks to shew what lies in the direct way of truth, or is quite besides it. And thus mathematicians do, who do not in every new problem run it back to the first axioms, through all the whole train of intermediate propositions. Certain theorems, that they have settled to themselves upon sure demonstration, serve to resolve to them multitudes of propositions which depend on them, and are as firmly made out from thence, as if the mind went afresh over every link of the whole chain that ties them to first self-evident principles. Only in other sciences great care is to be taken that they establish those intermediate principles with as much caution, exactness, and indifferency, as mathematicians use in the settling any of their great theorems. When this is not done, but men take up the principles in this or that science upon credit, inclination, interest, &c. in haste, without due examination, and most unquestionable proof, they lay a trap for themselves, and as much as in them lies captivate their understandings to mistake, falsehood and error.

§ 21. *Partiality.*

As there is a partiality to opinions, which, as we have already observed, is apt to mislead the understanding ; so there is often a partiality to studies, which is prejudicial also to knowledge and improvement. Those sciences, which men are particularly versed in, they are apt to value and extol, as if that part of knowledge, which every one has acquainted himself with, were that alone which was worth the having, and all the rest were idle, and empty amusements, compari-

tively of no use or importance. This is the effect of ignorance and not knowledge, the being vainly puffed up with a flatulency, arising from a weak and narrow comprehension. It is not amiss that every one should relish the science that he has made his peculiar study; a view of its beauties, and a sense of its usefulness, carries a man on with the more delight and warmth in the pursuit and improvement of it. But the contempt of all other knowledge, as if it were nothing in comparison of law or physic, of astronomy or chemistry, or perhaps some yet meaner part of knowledge, wherein I have got some smattering, or am somewhat advanced, is not only the mark of a vain or little mind, but does this prejudice in the conduct of the understanding, that it coops it up within narrow bounds, and hinders it from looking abroad into other provinces of the intellectual world, more beautiful possibly, and more fruitful than that which it had till then laboured in; wherein it might find, besides new knowledge, ways or hints whereby it might be enabled the better to cultivate its own.

§ 22. *Theology.*

THERE is indeed one science (as they are now distinguished) incomparably above all the rest, where it is not by corruption narrowed into a trade or faction, for mean or ill ends, and secular interests; I mean theology, which, containing the knowledge of God and his creatures, our duty to him and our fellow creatures, and a view of our present and future state, is the comprehension of all other knowledge directed to its true end; *i. e.* the honour and veneration of the Creator, and the happiness of mankind. This is that noble study which is every man's duty, and every one that can be called a rational creature is capable of. The works of nature, and the words of revelation, display it to mankind in characters so large and visible, that those who are not quite blind may in them read, and see the first principles and most necessary parts of it; and from thence, as they have time and industry, may be enabled to go on to the more abstruse parts of it, and penetrate into those infinite depths filled with the treasures of wisdom and

knowledge. This is that science which would truly enlarge mens minds, were it studied, or permitted to be studied every where, with that freedom, love of truth and charity which it teaches, and were not made, contrary to its nature, the occasion of strife, faction, malignity, and narrow impositions. I shall say no more here of this, but that it is undoubtedly a wrong use of my understanding, to make it the rule and measure of another man's; a use which it is neither fit for, nor capable of.

§ 23. *Partiality.*

THIS partiality, where it is not permitted an authority to render all other studies insignificant or contemptible, is often indulged so far as to be relied upon, and made use of in other parts of knowledge, to which it does not at all belong, and wherewith it has no manner of affinity. Some men have so used their heads to mathematical figures, that, giving a preference to the methods of that science, they introduce lines and diagrams into their study of divinity, or politic inquiries, as if nothing could be known without them; and others, accustomed to retired speculations, run natural philosophy into metaphysical notions, and the abstract generalities of logic; and how often may one meet with religion and morality treated of in the terms of the laboratory, and thought to be improved by the methods and notions of chemistry? But he, that will take care of the conduct of his understanding to direct it right to the knowledge of things, must avoid those undue mixtures, and not, by a fondness for what he has found useful and necessary in one, transfer it to another science, where it serves only to perplex and confound the understanding. It is a certain truth, that *res nolunt male administrari*, it is no less certain *res nolunt male intelligi*. Things themselves are to be considered as they are in themselves, and then they will show us in what way they are to be understood. For to have right conceptions about them, we must bring our understandings to the inflexible natures, and unalterable relations of things, and not endeavour to bring things to any preconceived notions of our own.

There is another partiality very commonly observable in men of study, no less prejudicial nor ridiculous than the former; and that is a fantastical and wild-attributing all knowledge to the ancients alone, or to the moderns. This raving upon antiquity in matter of poetry, Horace has wittily described and exposed in one of his satires. The same sort of madness may be found in reference to all the other sciences. Some will not admit an opinion not authorised by men of old, who were then all giants in knowledge. Nothing is to be put into the treasury of truth or knowledge, which has not the stamp of Greece or Rome upon it; and, since their days, will scarce allow that men have been able to see, think or write. Others with a like extravagancy, condemn all that the ancients have left us, and being taken with the modern inventions and discoveries, lay by all that went before, as if whatever is called old must have the decay of time upon it, and truth too were liable to mould and rottenness. Men, I think, have been much the same for natural endowments in all times. Fashion, discipline and education, have put eminent differences in the ages of several countries, and made one generation much differ from another in arts and sciences: But truth is always the same; time alters it not, nor is it the better or worse for being of ancient or modern tradition. Many were eminent in former ages of the world for their discovery and delivery of it; but though the knowledge they have left us be worth our study, yet they exhausted not all its treasure; they left a great deal for the industry and sagacity of after ages, and so shall we. That was once new to them, which any one now receives with veneration for its antiquity, nor was it the worse for appearing as a novelty; and that which is now embraced for its newness, will to posterity be old, but not thereby be less true or less genuine. There is no occasion on this account to oppose the ancients and the moderns to one another, or to be squeamish on either side. He, that wisely conducts his mind in the pursuit of knowledge, will gather what lights, and get what helps he can from either of them, from whom they are

best to be had, without adoring the errors, or rejecting the truths, which he may find mingled in them.

Another partiality may be observed, in some to vulgar, in others, to heterodox tenets: Some are apt to conclude, that what is the common opinion cannot but be true; so many mens eyes they think cannot but see right; so many mens understandings of all sorts cannot be deceived, and therefore will not venture to look beyond the received notions of the place and age, nor have so presumptuous a thought as to be wiser than their neighbours. They are content to go with the crowd, and so go easily, which they think is going right, or at least serves them as well. But however *vox Populi vox Dei* has prevailed as a maxim; yet I do not remember wherever God delivered his oracles by the multitude, or nature truths by the herd. On the other side, some fly all common opinions as either false or frivolous. The title of many-headed beast is a sufficient reason to them to conclude, that no truths of weight or consequence can be lodged there. Vulgar opinions are suited to vulgar capacities, and adapted to the ends of those that govern. He that will know the truth of things, must leave the common and beaten track, which none but weak and servile minds are satisfied to trudge along continually in. Such nice palates relish nothing but strange notions quite out of the way: Whatever is commonly received, has the mark of the beast on it; and they think it a lessening to them to hearken to it, or receive it; their mind runs only after paradoxes; these they seek, these they embrace, these alone they vent, and so, as they think, distinguish themselves from the vulgar. But common or uncommon are not the marks to distinguish truth or falsehood, and therefore should not be any bias to us in our inquiries. We should not judge of things by mens opinions, but of opinions by things. The multitude reason but ill, and therefore may be well suspected, and cannot be relied on, nor should be followed as a sure guide; but philosophers, who have quitted the orthodoxy of the community, and the popular doctrines of their countries, have fallen into as extrava-

gant and as absurd opinions as ever common reception countenanced. It would be madness to refuse to breathe the common air, or quench one's thirst with water, because the rabble use them to these purposes; and if there are conveniencies of life which common use reaches not, it is not reason to reject them, because they are not grown into the ordinary fashion of the country, and every villager doth not know them.

Truth, whether in or out of fashion, is the measure of knowledge, and the business of the understanding; whatsoever is besides that, however authorised by consent, or recommended by rarity, is nothing but ignorance, or something worse.

Another sort of partiality there is, whereby men impose upon themselves, and by it make their reading little useful to themselves; I mean the making use of the opinions of writers, and laying stress upon their authorities, wherever they find them to favour their own opinions.

There is nothing almost has done more harm to men dedicated to letters, than giving the name of study to reading, and making a man of great reading to be the same with a man of great knowledge, or at least to be a title of honour. All that can be recorded in writing, are only facts or reasonings. Facts are of three sorts;

1. Merely of natural agents, observable in the ordinary operations of bodies one upon another, whether in the visible course of things left to themselves, or in experiments made by men, applying agents and patients to one another after a peculiar and artificial manner.

2. Of voluntary agents, more especially the actions of men in society, which makes civil and moral history.

3. Of opinions.

In these three consists, as it seems to me, that which commonly has the name of learning; to which perhaps some may add a distinct head of critical writings, which indeed at bottom is nothing but matter of fact, and resolves itself into this, that such a man, or set of men,

used such a word or phrase in such a sense, *i. e.* that they made such sounds the marks of such ideas.

Under reasonings I comprehend all the discoveries of general truths made by human reason, whether found by intuition, demonstration, or probable deductions. And this is that which is, if not alone knowledge (because the truth or probability of particular propositions may be known too), yet is, as may be supposed, most properly the business of those who pretend to improve their understandings, and make themselves knowing by reading.

Books and reading are looked upon to be the great helps of the understanding, and instruments of knowledge, as it must be allowed that they are; and yet I beg leave to question whether these do not prove an hindrance to many, and keep several bookish men from attaining to solid and true knowledge. This, I think, I may be permitted to say, that there is no part wherein the understanding needs a more careful and wary conduct, than in the use of books; without which they will prove rather innocent amusements than profitable employments of our time, and bring but small additions to our knowledge.

There is not seldom to be found even amongst those who aim at knowledge, who with an unwearied industry employ their whole time in books, who scarce allow themselves time to eat or sleep, but read, and read, and read on, but yet make no great advances in real knowledge, though there be no defect in their intellectual faculties, to which their little progress can be imputed. The mistake here is, that it is usually supposed, that by reading, the author's knowledge is transfused into the reader's understanding; and so it is, but not by bare reading, but by reading and understanding what he writ. Whereby I mean, not barely comprehending what is affirmed or denied in each proposition (though that great readers do not always think themselves concerned precisely to do) but to see and follow the train of his reasonings, observe the strength and clearness of their connection, and examine upon what they bottom.

Without this a man may read the discourses of a very rational author, writ in a language, and in propositions that he very well understands, and yet acquire not one jot of his knowledge; which consisting only in the perceived, certain, or probable connection of the ideas made use of in his reasonings, the reader's knowledge is no farther increased than he perceives that; so much as he sees of this connection, so much he knows of the truth or probability of that author's opinions.

All that he relies on without this perception, he takes upon trust upon the author's credit, without any knowledge of it at all. This makes me not at all wonder to see some men so abound in citations, and build so much upon authorities, it being the sole foundation on which they bottom most of their own tenets; so that in effect they have but a second hand, or implicit knowledge, *i. e.* are in the right if such an one, from whom they borrowed it, were in the right in that opinion which they took from him, which indeed is no knowledge at all. Writers of this or former ages may be good witnesses of matters of fact which they deliver, which we may do well to take upon their authority; but their credit can go no farther than this, it cannot at all affect the truth and falsehood of opinions, which have no other sort of trial but reason and proof, which they themselves made use of to make themselves knowing, and so must others too that will partake in their knowledge. Indeed it is an advantage that they have been at the pains to find out the proofs, and lay them in that order that may show the truth or probability of their conclusions; and for this we owe them great acknowledgments for saving us the pains in searching out those proofs which they have collected for us, and which possibly, after all our pains, we might not have found, nor been able to have set them in so good a light as that which they left them us in. Upon this account we are mightily beholden to judicious writers of all ages, for those discoveries and discourses they have left behind them for our instruction, if we know how to make a right use of them; which is not to run them over in an hasty perusal, and perhaps lodge

their opinions, or some remarkable passages in our memories ; but to enter into their reasonings, examine their proofs, and then judge of the truth or falsehood, probability or improbability of what they advance ; not by any opinion we have entertained of the author, but by the evidence he produces, and the conviction he affords us, drawn from things themselves. Knowing is seeing, and if it be so, 'it is madness to persuade ourselves that we do so by another man's eyes, let him use ever so many words to tell us, that what he asserts is very visible. Till we ourselves see it with our own eyes, and perceive it by our own understandings, we are as much in the dark, and as void of knowledge as before, let us believe any learned author as much as we will.

Euclid and Archimedes are allowed to be knowing, and to have demonstrated what they say ; and yet whoever shall read over their writings without perceiving the connection of their proofs, and seeing what they show, though he may understand all their words, yet he is not the more knowing : He may believe indeed, but does not know what they say, and so is not advanced one jot in mathematical knowledge by all his reading of those approved mathematicians.

§ 24. *Haste.*

THE eagerness and strong bent of the mind after knowledge, if not warily regulated, is often an hindrance to it. It still presses into farther discoveries and new objects, and catches at the variety of knowledge, and therefore often stays not long enough on what is before it, to look into it as it should, for haste to pursue what is yet out of sight. He that rides post through a country, may be able, from the transient view, to tell how in general the parts lie, and may be able to give some loose description of here a mountain, and there a plain, here a morass, and there a river ; woodland in one part, and savanas in another. Such superficial ideas and observations as these he may collect in galloping over it : but the more useful observations of the soil, plants, animals and inhabitants, with their several sorts and properties, must necessarily escape him ; and it is seldom men ever

discover the rich mines, without some digging. Nature commonly lodges her treasure and jewels in rocky ground. If the matter be knotty, and the sense lies deep, the mind must stop and buckle to it, and stick upon it with labour and thought, and close contemplation, and not leave it till it has mastered the difficulty, and got possession of truth. But here care must be taken to avoid the other extreme: a man must not stick at every useless nicety, and expect mysteries of science in every trivial question or scruple that he may raise. He that will stand to pick up and examine every pebble that comes in his way, is as unlikely to return enriched and laden with jewels, as the other that travelled full speed. Truths are not the better nor the worse for their obviousness or difficulty, but their value is to be measured by their usefulness and tendency. Insignificant observations should not take up any of our minutes, and those that enlarge our view, and give light towards farther and useful discoveries, should not be neglected, though they stop our course, and spend some of our time in a fixed attention.

There is another haste that does often, and will mislead the mind if it be left to itself, and its own conduct. The understanding is naturally forward, not only to learn its knowledge by variety (which makes it skip over one to get speedily to another part of knowledge), but also eager to enlarge its views, by running too fast into general observations and conclusions, without a due examination of particulars enough whereon to found those general axioms. This seems to enlarge their stock, but it is of fancies not realities; such theories built upon narrow foundations stand but weakly, and, if they fall not of themselves, are at least very hardly to be supported against the assaults of opposition. And thus men being too hasty to erect to themselves general notions and ill-grounded theories, find themselves deceived in their stock of knowledge, when they come to examine their hastily assumed maxims themselves, or to have them attacked by others. General observations drawn from particulars, are the jewels of knowledge, comprehending great store in a little room; but they are therefore to be

made with the greater care and caution, lest if we take counterfeit for true, our loss and shame be the greater when our stock comes to a severe scrutiny. One or two particulars may suggest hints of inquiry, and they do well to take those hints; but if they turn them into conclusions, and make them presently general rules, they are forward indeed, but it is only to impose on themselves by propositions assumed for truths without sufficient warrant. To make such observations, is, as has been already remarked, to make the head a magazine of materials, which can hardly be called knowledge, or at least it is but like a collection of lumber not reduced to use or order; and he that makes every thing an observation, has the same useless plenty and much more falsehood mixed with it. The extremes on both sides are to be avoided, and he will be able to give the best account of his studies who keeps his understanding in the right mean between them.

§ 25. *Anticipation.*

WHETHER it be a love of that which brings the first light and information to their minds, and want of vigour and industry to inquire, or else that men content themselves with any appearance of knowledge, right or wrong; which, when they have once got, they will hold fast: this is visible, that many men give themselves up to the first anticipations of their minds, and are very tenacious of the opinions that first possess them; they are often as fond of their first conceptions as of their first born, and will by no means recede from the judgment they have once made, or any conjecture or conceit which they have once entertained. This is a fault in the conduct of the understanding, since this firmness, or rather stiffness of the mind, is not from an adherence to truth, but a submission to prejudice. It is an unreasonable homage paid to prepossession, whereby we show a reverence not to (what we pretend to seek) truth, but what by hap-hazard we chance to light on, be it what it will. This is visibly a preposterous use of our faculties, and is a downright prostituting of the mind to resign it thus, and put it under the power of the first comer.

This can never be allowed, or ought to be followed as a right way to knowledge, till the understanding (whose business it is to conform itself to what it finds on the objects without) can by its own opiniatrey change that, and make the unalterable nature of things comply with its own hasty determinations, which will never be. Whatever we fancy, things keep their course; and their habitudes, correspondencies and relations, keep the same to one another.

§ 26. *Resignation.*

CONTRARY to these, but by a like dangerous excess on the other side, are those who always resign their judgment to the last man they heard or read. Truth never sinks into these mens minds, nor gives any tincture to them, but cameleon-like, they take the colour of what is laid before them, and as soon lose and resign it to the next that happens to come in their way. The order wherein opinions are proposed, or received by us, is no rule of their rectitude, nor ought to be a cause of their preference. First or last in this case, is the effect of chance, and not the measure of truth or falsehood. This every one must confess, and therefore should, in the pursuit of truth, keep his mind free from the influence of any such accidents. A man may as reasonably draw cuts for his tenets, regulate his persuasion by the cast of a die, as take it up for its novelty, or retain it because it had his first assent, and he was never of another mind. Well-weighed reasons are to determine the judgment; those the mind should be always ready to hearken and submit to, and by their testimony, and suffrage, entertain or reject any tenet indifferently. whether it be a perfect stranger, or an old acquaintance.

§ 27. *Practice.*

THOUGH the faculties of the mind are improved by exercise, yet they must not be put to a stress beyond their strength. *Quid valeant humeri, quid ferre recusent*, must be made the measure of every one's understanding, who has a desire not only to perform well, but to keep up the vigour of his faculties and not to baulk his understanding by what is too hard for it. The mind, by being en-

gaged in a task beyond its strength, like the body, strained by lifting at a weight too heavy, has often its force broken, and thereby gets an unaptness or an aversion to any vigorous attempt ever after. A sinew cracked seldom recovers its former strength, or at least the tenderness of the sprain remains a good while after, and the memory of it longer, and leaves a lasting caution in the man, not to put the part quickly again to any robust employment. So it fares in the mind once jaded by an attempt above its power, it either is disabled for the future, or else checks at any vigorous undertaking ever after, at least is very hardly brought to exert its force again on any subject that requires thought and meditation. The understanding should be brought to the difficult and knotty parts of knowledge, that try the strength of thought, and a full bent of the mind by insensible degrees, and in such a gradual proceeding nothing is too hard for it. Nor let it be objected, that such a slow progress will never reach the extent of some sciences. It is not to be imagined how far constancy will carry a man; however it is better walking slowly in a rugged way, than to break a leg and be a cripple. He that begins with the calf may carry the ox; but he that will at first go to take up an ox, may so disable himself, as not be able to lift a calf after that. When the mind, by insensible degrees, has brought itself to attention and close thinking, it will be able to cope with difficulties, and master them without any prejudice to itself, and then it may go on roundly. Every abstruse problem, every intricate question will not baffle, discourage, or break it. But though putting the mind unprepared upon an unusual stress, that may discourage or damp it for the future, ought to be avoided; yet this must not run it, by an over-great shiness of difficulties, into a lazy sauntering about ordinary and obvious things, that demand no thought or application. This debases and enervates the understanding, makes it weak and unfit for labour. This is a sort of hovering about the surface of things, without any insight into them or penetration; and when the mind has been once habituated to this lazy recumbency and satisfaction on

the obvious surface of things, it is in danger to rest satisfied there, and go no deeper, since it cannot do it without pains and digging. He, that has for some time accustomed himself to take up with what easily offers itself at first view, has reason to fear he shall never reconcile himself to the fatigue of turning and tumbling of things in his mind, to discover their more retired and more valuable secrets.

It is not strange that methods of learning, which scholars have been accustomed to in their beginning and entrance upon the sciences, should influence them all their lives, and be settled in their minds by an over-ruling reverence, especially if they be such as universal use has established. Learners must at first be believers, and their master's rules having been once made axioms to them, it is no wonder they should keep that dignity, and by the authority they have once got, mislead those who think it sufficient to excuse them, if they go out of their way in a well-beaten-track.

§ 28. *Words.*

I HAVE copiously enough spoken of the abuse of words in another place, and therefore shall, upon this reflection that the sciences are full of them, warn those that would conduct their understandings right, not to take any term howsoever authorised by the language of the schools, to stand for any thing till they have an idea of it. A word may be of frequent use and great credit with several authors, and be by them made use of as if it stood for some real being; but yet if he that reads cannot frame any distinct idea of that being, it is certain to him a mere empty sound without a meaning, and he learns no more by all that is said of it, or attributed to it, than if it were affirmed only of that bare empty sound. They who would advance in knowledge, and not deceive and swell themselves with a little articulated air, should lay down this as a fundamental rule, not to take words for things, nor suppose that names in books signify real entities in nature, till they can frame clear and distinct ideas of those entities. It will not perhaps be allowed, if I should set down *substantial forms* and *intentional species*, as such that may just-

ly be suspected to be of this kind of insignificant terms. But this I am sure, to one that can form no determined ideas of what they stand for, they signify nothing at all; and all that he thinks he knows about them, is to him so much knowledge about nothing, and amounts at most but to a learned ignorance. It is not without all reason supposed, that there are many such empty terms to be found in some learned writers to which they had recourse to etch out their systems where their understandings could not furnish them with conceptions from things. But yet I believe the supposing of some realities in nature, answering those and the like words, have much perplexed some, and quite misled others in the study of nature. That which in any discourse signifies, *I know not what*, should be considered *I know not when*. Where men have any conceptions, they can, if they are ever so abstruse or abstracted, explain them, and the terms they use for them. For our conceptions being nothing but ideas, which are all made up of simple ones: if they cannot give us the ideas their words stand for, it is plain they have none. To what purpose can it be to hunt after his conceptions, who has none, or none distinct? He that knew not what he himself meant by a learned term, cannot make us know any thing by his use of it, let us beat our heads about it ever so long. Whether we are able to comprehend all the operations of nature, and the manners of them, it matters not to inquire; but this is certain, that we can comprehend no more of them than we can directly conceive; and therefore to obtrude terms where we have no distinct conceptions, as if they did contain, or rather conceal something, is but an artifice of learned vanity, to cover a defect in an hypothesis or our understandings. Words are not made to conceal but to declare and show something: where they are, by those, who pretend to instruct, otherwise used, they conceal indeed something; but that which they conceal is nothing but the ignorance, error, or sophistry of the talker, for there is, in truth, nothing else under them.

§ 29. *Wandering.*

THAT there is constant succession and flux of ideas in

our minds, I have observed in the former part of this essay, and every one may take notice of it in himself. This, I suppose, may deserve some part of our care in the conduct of our understandings; and I think it may be of great advantage, if we can by use get that power over our minds, as to be able to direct that train of ideas, that so, since there will new ones perpetually come into our thoughts by a constant succession, we may be able by choice so to direct them, that none may come in view, but such as are pertinent to our present inquiry, and in such order as may be most useful to the discovery we are upon; or at least, if some foreign and unsought ideas will offer themselves, that yet we might be able to reject them, and keep them from taking off our minds from its present pursuit, and hinder them, from running away with our thoughts quite from the subject in hand. This is not, I suspect, so easy to be done, as perhaps may be imagined; and yet, for ought I know, this may be, if not the chief, yet one of the great differences that carry some men in their reasoning so far beyond others, where they seem to be naturally of equal parts. A proper and effectual remedy for this wandering of thoughts I would be glad to find. He, that shall propose such an one, would do great service to the studious and contemplative part of mankind, and perhaps help unthinking men to become thinking. I must acknowledge that hitherto I have discovered no other way to keep our thoughts close to their business, but the endeavouring as much as we can, and by frequent attention and application, getting the habit of attention and application. He that will observe children, will find, that even when they endeavour their utmost, they cannot keep their minds from straggling. The way to cure it, I am satisfied, is not angry chiding or beating, for that presently fills their heads with all the ideas that fear, dread, or confusion can offer to them. To bring back gently their wandering thoughts, by leading them into the path, and going before them in the train they should pursue, without any rebuke, or so much as taking notice (where it can be avoided) of their roving, I sup-

pose would sooner reconcile and inure them to attention, than all those rougher methods which more distract their thought, and, hindering the application they would promote, introduce a contrary habit.

§ 30. *Distinction.*

DISTINCTION and division are (if I mistake not the import of the words) very different things; the one being the perception of a difference that nature has placed in things; the other our making a division where there is yet none; at least, if I may be permitted to consider them in this sense, I think I may say of them, that one of them is the most necessary and conducive to true knowledge that can be; the other, when too much made use of, serves only to puzzle and confound the understanding. To observe every the least difference that is in things, argues a quick and clear sight, and this keeps the understanding steady and right in its way to knowledge. But though it be useful to discern every variety that is to be found in nature, yet it is not convenient to consider every difference that is in things, and divide them into distinct classes under every such difference. This will run us, if followed, into particulars (for every individual has something that differences it from another), and we shall be able to establish no general truths, or else at least shall be apt to perplex the mind about them. The collection of several things into several classes, gives the mind more general and larger views; but we must take care to unite them only in that, and so far as they do agree; for so far they may be united under the consideration. For entity itself, that comprehends all things, as general as it is, may afford us clear and rational conceptions. If we would weigh and keep in our minds what it is we are considering, that would best instruct us when we should, or should not branch into farther distinctions, which are to be taken only from a due contemplation of things; to which there is nothing more opposite than the art of verbal distinctions, made at pleasure in learned and arbitrarily invented terms, to be applied at a venture, without comprehending or conveying any distinct notions, and so altogether fitted to artificial talk,

or empty noise in dispute, without any clearing of difficulties, or advance in knowledge. Whatsoever subject we examine and would get knowledge in, we should, I think, make as general and as large as it will bear; nor can there be any danger of this, if the idea of it be settled and determined: For if that be so, we shall easily distinguish it from any other idea, though comprehended under the same name. For it is to fence against the entanglements of equivocal words, and the great art of sophistry which lies in them, that distinctions have been multiplied, and their use thought necessary. But had every distinct abstract idea a distinct known name, there would be little need of these multiplied scholastic distinctions, though there would be nevertheless as much need still of the mind's observing the differences that are in things, and discriminating them thereby one from another. It is not, therefore, the right way to knowledge, to hunt after, and fill the head with abundance of artificial and scholastic distinctions, wherewith learned mens writings are often filled; we sometimes find what they treat of so divided and subdivided, that the mind of the most attentive reader loses the sight of it, as it is more than probable the writer himself did; for in things crumbled into dust, it is in vain to affect or pretend order, or expect clearness. To avoid confusion by too few or too many divisions, is a great skill in thinking as well as writing, which is but the copying our thoughts; but what are the boundaries of the mean between the two vicious excesses on both hands, I think is hard to set down in words: Clear and distinct ideas is all that I yet know able to regulate it. But as to verbal distinctions received and applied to common terms, *i. e.* equivocal words; they are more properly, I think, the business of criticisms and dictionaries than of real knowledge and philosophy, since they, for the most part, explain the meaning of words, and give us their several significations. The dexterous management of terms, and being able to *send* and *prove* with them, I know has and does pass in the world for a great part of learning; but it is learning distinct from knowledge; for knowledge consists only in perceiving the habitudes and rela-

tions of ideas one to another, which is done without words; the intervention of a sound helps nothing to it. And hence we see that there is least use of distinctions where there is most knowledge; I mean in mathematics, where men have determined ideas with known names to them; and so there being no room for equivocations, there is no need of distinctions. In arguing, the opponent uses as comprehensive and equivocal terms as he can, to involve his adversary in the doubtfulness of his expressions: This is expected, and therefore the answerer on his side makes it his play to distinguish as much as he can, and thinks he can never do it too much, nor can he indeed in that way wherein victory may be had without truth and without knowledge. This seems to me to be the art of disputing. Use your words as captiously as you can in your arguing on one side, and apply distinctions as much as you can on the other side to every term, to nonplus your opponent; so that in this sort of scholarship, there being no bounds set to distinguishing, some men have thought all acuteness to have lain in it: and therefore in all they have read or thought on, their great business has been to amuse themselves with distinctions, and multiply to themselves divisions, at least, more than the nature of the thing required. There seems to me, as I said, to be no other rule for this, but a due and right consideration of things as they are in themselves. He that has settled in his mind determined ideas, with names affixed to them, will be able both to discern their differences one from another, which is really distinguishing; and, where the penury of words affords not terms answering every distinct idea, will be able to apply proper distinguishing terms to the comprehensive and equivocal names he is forced to make use of. This is all the need I know of distinguishing terms; and in such verbal distinctions, each term of the distinction, joined to that whose signification it distinguishes, is but a distinct name for a distinct idea. Where they are so, and men have clear and distinct conceptions that answer their verbal distinctions, they are right, and are pertinent as far as they serve to clear

any thing in the subject under consideration. And this is that which seems to me the proper and only measure of distinctions and divisions ; which he that will conduct his understanding right, must not look for in the acuteness of invention, nor the authority of writers, but will find only in the consideration of things themselves, whether they are led into it by their own meditations, or the information of books.

An aptness to jumble things together, wherein can be found any likeness, is a fault in the understanding on the other side, which will not fail to mislead it, and by thus lumping of things, hinder the mind from distinct and accurate conceptions of them.

§ 31. *Similes.*

To which let me here add another near of kin to this, at least in name, and that is letting the mind upon the suggestion of any new notion, run immediately after similes to make it the clearer to itself ; which, though it may be a good way, and useful in the explaining our thoughts to others ; yet it is by no means a right method to settle true notions of any thing in ourselves, because similes always fail in some part, and come short of that exactness which our conceptions should have to things, if we would think aright. This indeed makes men plausible talkers ; for those are always most acceptable in discourse who have the way to let their thoughts into other mens minds with the greatest ease and facility ; whether those thoughts are well formed and correspond with things, matters not ; few men care to be instructed but at an easy rate. They, who in their discourse strike the fancy, and take the hearers conceptions along with them as fast as their words flow, are the applauded talkers, and go for the only men of clear thoughts. Nothing contributes so much to this as similes, whereby men think they themselves understand better, because they are the better understood. But it is one thing to think aright, and another thing to know the right way to lay our thoughts before others with advantage and clearness, be they right or wrong. Well chosen similes, metaphors, and allegories, with method

and order, do this the best of any thing, because being taken from objects already known, and familiar to the understanding, they are conceived as fast as spoken; and the correspondence being concluded, the thing they are brought to explain and elucidate is thought to be understood too. Thus fancy passes for knowledge, and what is prettily said is mistaken for solid. I say not this to decry metaphor, or with design to take away that ornament of speech; my business here is not with rhetoricians and orators, but with philosophers and lovers of truth; to whom I would beg leave to give this one rule whereby to try whether, in the application of their thoughts to any thing for the improvement of their knowledge, they do in truth comprehend the matter before them really such as it is in itself. The way to discover this is to observe, whether in the laying it before themselves or others, they make use only of borrowed representations and ideas foreign to the things which are applied to it by way of accommodation, as bearing some proportion or imagined likeness to the subject under consideration. Figured and metaphorical expressions do well to illustrate more abstruse and unfamiliar ideas which the mind is not yet thoroughly accustomed to: but then they must be made use of to illustrate ideas that we already have, not to paint to us those which we yet have not. Such borrowed and allusive ideas may follow real and solid truth, to set it off when found, but must by no means be set in its place, and taken for it. If all our search has yet reached no farther than simile or metaphor, we may assure ourselves we rather fancy than know, and are not yet penetrated into the inside and reality of the thing, be it what it will, but content ourselves with what our imaginations, not things themselves, furnish us with.

§ 32. *Assent.*

IN the whole conduct of the understanding, there is nothing of more moment than to know when and where, and how far to give assent, and possibly there is nothing harder. It is very easily said, and nobody questions it, that giving and with-holding our assent, and the degrees

of it, should be regulated by the evidence which things carry with them; and yet we see men are not the better for this rule; some firmly embrace doctrines upon slight grounds, some upon no grounds, and some contrary to appearance: Some admit of certainty, and are not to be moved in what they hold: Others waver in every thing, and there want not those that reject all as uncertain. What then shall a novice, an inquirer, a stranger do in the case? I answer, use his eyes. There is a correspondence in things, and agreement and disagreement in ideas, discernible in very different degrees, and there are eyes in men to see them if they please, only their eyes may be dimmed or dazzled, and the discerning sight in them impaired or lost. Interest and passion dazzles; the custom of arguing on any side, even against our persuasions, dims the understanding, and makes it by degrees lose the faculty of discerning clearly between truth and falsehood, and so of adhering to the right side. It is not safe to play with error, and dress it up to ourselves or others in the shape of truth. The mind by degrees loses its natural relish of real solid truth, is reconciled insensibly to any thing than can be dressed up into any faint appearance of it; and if the fancy be allowed the place of judgment at first in sport, it afterwards comes by use to usurp it, and what is recommended by this flatterer (that studies but to please) is received for good. There are so many ways of fallacy, such arts of giving colours, appearances, and resemblances by this court dresser, the fancy, that he, who is not wary to admit nothing but truth itself, very careful not to make his mind subservient to any thing else, cannot but be caught. He that has a mind to believe has half assented already; and he, that by often arguing against his own sense, imposes falsehoods on others, is not far from believing himself. This takes away the great distance there is betwixt truth and falsehood; it brings them almost together, and makes it no great odds, in things that approach so near, which you take; and when things are brought to that pass, passion or interest, &c. easily,

and without being perceived, determine which shall be the right.

§ 33. *Indifferency.*

I HAVE said above, that we should keep a perfect indifferency for all opinions, not wish any of them true, or try to make them appear so; but being indifferent, receive and embrace them according as evidence, and that alone, gives the attestation of truth. They that do thus, *i. e.* keep their mind indifferent to opinions, to be determined only by evidence, will always find the understanding has perception enough to distinguish between evidence or no evidence, betwixt plain and doubtful; and if they neither give nor refuse their assent but by that measure, they will be safe in the opinions they have. Which being perhaps but few, this caution will have also this good in it, that it will put them upon considering, and teach them the necessity of examining more than they do; without which, the mind is but a receptacle of inconsistencies, not the storehouse of truths. They, that do not keep up this indifferency in themselves for all but truth, not supposed, but evidenced in themselves, put coloured spectacles before their eyes, and look on things through false glasses, and then think themselves excused in following the false appearances which they themselves put upon them. I do not expect that by this way the assent should in every one be proportioned to the grounds and clearness wherewith every truth is capable to be made out, or that men should be perfectly kept from error: That is more than human nature can by any means be advanced to; I aim at no such unattainable privilege; I am only speaking of what they should do, who would deal fairly with their own minds, and make a right use of their faculties in the pursuit of truth; we fail them a great deal more than they fail us. It is mismanagement more than want of abilities that men have reason to complain of, and which they actually do complain of in those that differ from them. He, that by an indifferency for all but truth, suffers not his assent to go faster than his evidence, nor beyond it, will learn to examine, and exa-

mine fairly instead of presuming; and nobody will be at a loss, or in danger for want of embracing those truths which are necessary in his station and circumstances. In any other way but this all the world are born to orthodoxy; they imbibe at first the allowed opinions of their country and party, and so never questioning their truth, not one of an hundred ever examines. They are applauded for presuming they are in the right. He that considers, is a foe to orthodoxy, because possibly he may deviate from some of the received doctrines there. And thus men, without any industry or acquisition of their own, inherit local truths (for it is not the same every where), and are inured to assent without evidence. This influences farther than is thought; for what one of an hundred of the zealous bigots in all parties, ever examined the tenets he is so stiff in, or ever thought it his business or duty so to do? It is suspected of lukewarmness to suppose it necessary, and a tendency to apostasy to go about it. And if a man can bring his mind once to be positive and fierce for positions, whose evidence he has never once examined, and that in matters of greatest concernment to him, what shall keep him from this short and easy way of being in the right in cases of less moment? Thus we are taught to clothe our minds as we do our bodies after the fashion in vogue, and it is accounted fantasticalness, or something worse not to do so. This custom (which who dares oppose) makes the short-sighted bigots, and the warier sceptics, as far as it prevails. And those that break from it are in danger of heresy: for taking the whole world, how much of it doth truth and orthodoxy possess together? Though it is by the last alone (which has the good luck to be every where) that error and heresy are judged of; for argument and evidence signify nothing in the case, and excuse no where, but are sure to be borne down in all societies by the infallible orthodoxy of the place. Whether this be the way to truth and right assent, let the opinions that take place and prescribe in the several habitable parts of the earth, declare. I never saw any reason yet why truth might not be trusted to its own evidence: I am sure if that be not able to sup-

port it, there is no fence against error, and then truth and falsehood are but names that stand for the same things. Evidence, therefore, is that by which alone every man is (and should be) taught to regulate his assent, who is then, and then only, in the right way when he follows it.

Men deficient in knowledge are usually in one of these three states: either wholly ignorant; or as doubting of some proposition they have either embraced formerly, or at present are inclined to: Or, lastly, they do with assurance hold and profess without ever having examined, and being convinced by well-grounded arguments.

The first of these are in the best state of the three, by having their minds yet in their perfect freedom and indifferency, the likelier to pursue truth the better, having no bias yet clapped on to mislead them.

§ 34.

FOR ignorance with an indifferency for truth is nearer to it, than opinion with ungrounded inclination, which is the great source of error; and they are more in danger to go out of the way, who are marching under the conduct of a guide, than it is an hundred to one will mislead them, than he that has not yet taken a step, and is likelier to be prevailed on to inquire after the right way. The last of the three sorts are in the worst condition of all: for if a man can be persuaded, and fully assured of any thing for a truth, without having examined what is there that he may not embrace for truth; and if he has given himself up to believe a lie, what means is there left to recover one who can be assured without examining? To the other two this I crave leave to say, that as he that is ignorant is in the best state of the two, so he should pursue truth in a method suitable to that state, *i. e.* by inquiring directly into the nature of the thing itself, without minding the opinions of others, or troubling himself with their questions or disputes about it, but to see what he himself can, sincerely searching after truth, find out. He that proceeds upon other principles in his inquiry into any sciences, though he be resolved to examine them,

and judge of them freely, does yet at least put himself on that side, and post himself in a party which he will not quit till he be beaten out; by which the mind is insensibly engaged to make what defence it can, and so is unawares biassed. I do not say but a man should embrace some opinion when he has examined, else he examines to no purpose; but the surest and safest way is to have no opinion at all till he has examined, and that without any the least regard to the opinions or systems of other men about it. For example, were it my business to understand physic, would not the safer and readier way be to consult nature herself, and inform myself in the history of diseases and their cures, than espousing the principles of the dogmatists, methodists or chemists, engage in all the disputes concerning either of those systems, and suppose it to be true, till I have tried what they can say to beat me out of it? Or, supposing that Hippocrates, or any other book, infallibly contains the whole art of physic, would not the direct way be to study, read, and consider that book, weigh and compare the parts of it to find the truth, rather than espouse the doctrines of any party; who, though they acknowledge his authority, have already interpreted and wire-drawn all his text to their own sense; the tincture thereof when I have imbibed, I am more in danger to misunderstand his true meaning, than if I had come to him with a mind unprepossessed by doctors and commentators of my sect, whose reasonings, interpretation and language which I have been used to, will of course make all chime that way, and make another, and perhaps the genuine meaning of the author seem harsh, strained and uncouth to me? For words having naturally none of their own, carry that signification to the hearer, that he is used to put upon them, whatever be the sense of him that uses them. This, I think, is visibly so; and if it be, he that begins to have any doubt of any of his tenets, which he received without examination, ought as much as he can, to put himself wholly into this state of igno-

rance in reference to that question, and throwing wholly by all his former notions, and the opinions of others, examine with a perfect indifferency, the question in its source, without any inclination to either side, or any regard to his or others unexamined opinions. This, I own, is no easy thing to do, but I am not inquiring the easy way to opinion, but the right way to truth; which they must follow who will deal fairly with their own understandings and their own souls.

§ 35. *Question.*

THE indifferency that I here propose, will also enable them to state the question right, which they are in doubt about, without which they can never come to a fair and clear decision of it.

§ 36. *Perseverance.*

ANOTHER fruit from this indifferency, and the considering things in themselves abstract from our own opinions and other mens notions, and discourses on them, will be, that each man will pursue his thoughts in that method which will be most agreeable to the nature of the thing, and to his apprehension of what it suggests to him; in which he ought to proceed with regularity and constancy, until he come to a well-grounded resolution wherein he may acquiesce. If it be objected that this will require every man to be a scholar, and quit all his other business, and betake himself wholly to study; I answer, I propose no more to any one than he has time for. Some mens state and condition requires no great extent of knowledge; the necessary provision for life swallows the greatest part of their time. But one man's want of leisure is no excuse for the oscitancy and ignorance of those who have time to spare; and every one has enough to get as much knowledge as is required and expected of him; and he that does not that, is in love with ignorance, and is accountable for it.

§ 37. *Presumption.*

THE variety of distempers in mens minds is as great as of those in their bodies; some are epidemic, few

escape them, and every one too, if he would look into himself, would find some defect of his particular genius. There is scarce any one without some idiosyncrasy that he suffers by. This man presumes upon his parts, that they will not fail him at time of need, and so thinks it superfluous labour to make any provision before hand. His understanding is to him like *Fortunatus's* purse, which is always to furnish him without ever putting any thing into it before-hand; and so he sits still satisfied, without endeavouring to store his understanding with knowledge. It is the spontaneous product of the country, and what need of labour in tillage? Such men may spread their native riches before the ignorant; but they were best not come to stress and trial with the skilful. We are born ignorant of every thing. The superficies of things that surround them, make impressions on the negligent; but nobody penetrates into the inside without labour, attention and industry. Stones and timber grow of themselves, but yet there is no uniform pile with symmetry and convenience to lodge in, without toil and pains. God has made the intellectual world harmonious and beautiful without us; but it will never come into our heads all at once, we must bring it home piece-meal, and there set it up by our own industry, or else we shall have nothing but darkness and a chaos within, whatever order and light there be in things without us.

§ 38. *Despondency.*

ON the other side, there are others that depress their own minds, despond at the first difficulty, and conclude that the getting an insight in any of the sciences, or making any progress in knowledge farther than serves their ordinary business, is above their capacities. These sit still, because they think they have not legs to go as the others I last mentioned do, because they think they have wings to fly, and can soar on high when they please. To these latter one may for answer apply the proverb, *use legs and have legs*. Nobody knows what strength of parts he has till he has tried

them. And of the understanding one may most truly say, that its force is greater generally than it thinks, till it is put to it. *Viresque acquirit eundo.*

And therefore the proper remedy here is but to set the mind to work, and apply the thoughts vigorously to the business; for it holds in the struggles of the mind as in those of war, *Dum putant se vincere, vincere*; a persuasion that we shall overcome any difficulties that we meet with in the sciences, seldom fails to carry us through them. Nobody knows the strength of his mind, and the force of steady and regular application, till he has tried. This is certain, he that sets out upon weak legs, will not only go farther, but grow stronger too than one, who with a vigorous constitution and firm limbs, only sits still.

Something of kin to this, men may observe in themselves, when the mind frights itself (as it often does) with any thing reflected on in gross, and transiently viewed confusedly, and at a distance. Things thus offered to the mind, carry the show of nothing but difficulty in them, and are thought to be wrapped up in impenetrable obscurity. But the truth is, these are nothing but spectres that the understanding raises to itself, to flatter its own laziness. It sees nothing distinctly in things remote, and in a huddle; and therefore concludes too faintly, that there is nothing more clear to be discovered in them. It is but to approach nearer, and that mist of our own raising that enveloped them will remove; and those that in that mist appeared hideous giants not to be grappled with, will be found to be of the ordinary and natural size and shape. Things, that in a remote and confused view seem very obscure, must be approached by gentle and regular steps; and what is most visible, easy and obvious in them first considered. Reduce them into their distinct parts; and then in their due order bring all that should be known concerning every one of those parts into plain and simple questions; and then what was thought obscure, perplexed, and too hard for our weak parts, will lay itself open to the understanding

in a fair view, and let the mind into that which before it was awed with, and kept at a distance from, as wholly mysterious. I appeal to my reader's experience, whether this has never happened to him, especially when, busy on one thing, he has occasionally reflected on another. I ask him, whether he has never thus been scared with a sudden opinion of mighty difficulties, which yet have vanished, when he has seriously and methodically applied himself to the consideration of this seeming terrible subject; and there has been no other matter of astonishment left, but that he amused himself with so discouraging a prospect of his own raising, about a matter, which in the handling was found to have nothing in it more strange nor intricate than several other things which he had long since, and with ease mastered. This experience would teach us how to deal with such bugbears another time, which should rather serve to excite our vigour than enervate our industry. The surest way for a learner in this, as in all other cases, is not to advance by jumps and large strides; let that which he sets himself to learn next be indeed the next, *i. e.* as nearly conjoined with what he knows already as is possible; let it be distinct, but not remote from it: Let it be new, and what he did not know before, that the understanding may advance; but let it be as little at once as may be, that its advances may be clear and sure. All the ground that it gets this way it will hold. This distinct gradual growth in knowledge is firm and sure, it carries its own light with it in every step of its progression in an easy and orderly train, than which there is nothing of more use to the understanding. And though this perhaps may seem a very slow and lingering way to knowledge; yet I dare confidently affirm, that whoever will try it in himself, or any one he will teach, shall find the advances greater in this method, than they would in the same space of time have been in any other he could have taken. The greatest part of true knowledge lies in a distinct perception of things in themselves distinct. And some

men give more clear light and knowledge by the bare distinct stating of a question, than others by talking of it in gross whole hours together. In this, they who so state a question, do no more but separate and disentangle the parts of it one from another, and lay them, when so disentangled, in their due order. This often, without any thing more ado, resolves the doubt, and shows the mind where the truth lies. The agreement or disagreement of the ideas in question, when they are once separated and distinctly considered, is, in many cases, presently perceived, and thereby clear and lasting knowledge gained; whereas, things in gross taken up together, and so lying together in confusion, can produce in the mind but a confused, which in effect is no knowledge; or at least when it comes to be examined and made use of, will prove little better than none. I therefore take the liberty to repeat here again what I have said elsewhere, that in learning any thing, as little should be proposed to the mind at once as is possible; and that being understood and fully mastered, to proceed to the next adjoining part, yet unknown, simple, unperplexed proposition belonging to the matter in hand, and tending to the clearing what is principally designed.

§ 39. *Analogy.*

ANALOGY is of great use to the mind in many cases, especially in natural philosophy; and that part of it chiefly which consists in happy and successful experiments. But here we must take care that we keep ourselves within that wherein the analogy consists. For example, the acid oil of *vitriol* is found to be good in such a case, therefore the spirit of *nitre* or *vinegar* may be used in the like case. If the good effect of it be owing wholly to the acidity of it, the trial may be justified; but if there be something else besides the acidity in the oil of *vitriol*, which produces the good we desire in the case, we mistake that for analogy, which is not, and suffer our understanding to be misguided by a wrong supposition of analogy where there is none.

§ 40. *Association.*

THOUGH I have in the second book of my *Essay* concerning Human Understanding, treated of the association of ideas ; yet having done it there historically, as giving a view of the understanding in this as well as its several other ways of operating, rather than designing there to inquire into the remedies that ought to be applied to it : It will, under this latter consideration, afford other matter of thought to those who have a mind to instruct themselves thoroughly in the right way of conducting their understandings ; and that the rather because this, if I mistake not, is as frequent a cause of mistake and error in us, as perhaps any thing else that can be named ; and is a disease of the mind as hard to be cured as any ; it being a very hard thing to convince any one that things are not so, and naturally so as they constantly appear to him.

By this one easy and unheeded miscarriage of the understanding, sandy and loose foundations become infallible principles, and will not suffer themselves to be touched or questioned : Such unnatural connections become by custom as natural to the mind as sun and light : Fire and warmth go together, and so seem to carry with them as natural an evidence as self-evident truths themselves. And where then shall one with hopes of success begin the cure ? Many men firmly embrace falsehood for truth ; not only because they never thought otherwise, but also because thus blinded as they have been from the beginning, they never could think otherwise ; at least without a vigour of mind able to contest the empire of habit, and look into its own principles ; a freedom which few men have the notion of in themselves, and fewer are allowed the practice of by others ; it being the great art and business of the teachers and guides in most sects, to suppress, as much as they can, this fundamental duty which every man owes himself, and is the first steady step towards right and truth in the whole train of his actions and opinions. This would give one reason to suspect, that such teachers are conscious to themselves

of the falsehood or weakness of the tenets they profess, since they will not suffer the grounds whereon they are built to be examined; whereas those who seek truth only, and desire to own and propagate nothing else, freely expose their principles to the test, are pleased to have them examined, give men leave to reject them if they can; and if there be any thing weak and unsound in them, are willing to have it detected, that they themselves, as well as others, may not lay any stress upon any received proposition beyond what the evidence of its truth will warrant and allow.

There is, I know, a great fault among all sorts of people of principling their children and scholars; which at last, when looked into, amounts to no more, but making them imbibe their teacher's notions and tenets, by an implicit faith, and firmly to adhere to them whether true or false. What colours may be given to this, or of what use it may be when practised upon the vulgar, destined to labour, and given up to the service of their bellies, I will not here inquire. But as to the ingenious part of mankind, whose condition allows them leisure, and letters, and inquiry after truth; I can see no other right way of principling them, but to take heed, as much as may be, that in their tender years, ideas, that have no natural cohesion, come not to be united in their heads, and that this rule be often inculcated to them to be their guide in the whole course of their lives and studies, (*viz.*) That they never suffer any ideas to be joined in their understandings, in any other or stronger combination than what their own nature and correspondence give them; and that they often examine those that they find linked together in their minds, whether this association of ideas be from the visible agreement that is in the ideas themselves, or from the habitual and prevailing custom of the mind joining them thus together in thinking.

This is for caution against this evil, before it be thoroughly riveted by custom in the understanding;

but he, that would cure it when habit has established it, must nicely observe the very quick and almost imperceptible motions of the mind in its habitual actions. What I have said in another place about the change of the ideas of sense into those of judgment, may be proof of this. Let any one not skilled in painting, be told when he sees bottles and tobacco-pipes, and other things so painted, as they are in some places shown, that he does not see protuberances, and you will not convince him but by the touch: He will not believe that by an instantaneous legerdemain of his own thoughts, one idea is substituted for the other. How frequent instances may one meet with of this in the arguings of the learned, who not seldom in two ideas that they have been accustomed to join in their minds, substitute one for the other; and, I am apt to think, often without perceiving it themselves? This, whilst they are under the deceit of it, makes them incapable of conviction; and they applaud themselves as zealous champions for truth, when indeed they are contending for error. And the confusion of two different ideas, which a customary connection of them in their minds hath made to them almost one, fills their head with false views, and their reasonings with false consequences.

§ 41. *Fallacies.*

RIGHT understanding consists in the discovery and adherence to truth, and that in the perception of the visible or probable agreement or disagreement of ideas, as they are affirmed and denied one of another. From whence it is evident, that the right use and conduct of the understanding, whose business is purely truth and nothing else, is, that the mind should be kept in a perfect indifferency, not inclining to either side, any farther than evidence settles it by knowledge, or the over-balance of probability gives it the turn of assent and belief; but yet it is very hard to meet with any discourse wherein one may not perceive the author not only maintain (for that is reasonable and fit), but inclined and biased to one side of the question, with

marks of a desire that that should be true. If it be asked me, how authors who have such a bias, and lean to it, may be discovered? I answer, by observing how in their writings or arguings they are often led by their inclinations to change the ideas of the question, either by changing the terms, or by adding and joining others to them, whereby the ideas under consideration are so varied, as to be more serviceable to their purpose, and to be thereby brought to an easier and nearer agreement, or more visible and remoter disagreement one with another. This is plain and direct sophistry; but I am far from thinking, that wherever it is found, it is made use of with design to deceive and mislead the readers. It is visible that mens prejudices and inclinations by this way impose often upon themselves; and their affection for truth, under their prepossession in favour of one side, is the very thing that leads them from it. Inclination suggests and slides into their discourse favourable terms, which introduce favourable ideas; till at last by this means that is concluded clear and evident, thus dressed up, which, taken in its native state, by making use of none but the precise determined ideas, would find no admittance at all. The putting these glosses on what they affirm, these, as they are thought, handsome, easy and graceful explications of what they are discoursing on, is so much the character of what is called and esteemed writing well, that is very hard to think that authors will ever be persuaded to leave what serves so well to propagate their opinions, and procure themselves credit in the world, for a more jejune and dry way of writing, by keeping to the same terms precisely annexed to the same ideas, a sour and blunt stiffness tolerable in mathematicians only, who force their way, and make truth prevail by irresistible demonstration.

But yet if authors cannot be prevailed with to quit the looser, though more insinuating ways of writing, if they will not think fit to keep close to truth and instruction by unvaried terms, and plain unsophisti-

cated arguments; yet it concerns readers not to be imposed on by fallacies, and the prevailing ways of insinuation. To do this, the surest and most effectual remedy, is to fix in the mind the clear and distinct ideas of the question stripped of words; and so likewise in the train of argumentation, to take up the author's ideas, neglecting his words, observing how they connect or separate those in the question. He that does this will be able to cast off all that is superfluous; he will see what is pertinent, what coherent, what is direct to, what slides by, the question. This will readily show him all the foreign ideas in the discourse, and where they were brought in; and though they perhaps dazzled the writer, yet he will perceive that they give no light nor strength to his reasonings.

This, though it be the shortest and easiest way of reading books with profit, and keeping one's self from being misled by great names or plausible discourses; yet it being hard and tedious to those who have not accustomed themselves to it; it is not to be expected that every one (amongst those few who really pursue truth) should this way guard his understanding from being imposed on by the wilful, or at least undesigned sophistry, which creeps into most of the books of argument. They, that write against their conviction, or that next to them, are resolved to maintain the tenets of a party they are engaged in, cannot be supposed to reject any arms that may help to defend their cause, and therefore such should be read with the greatest caution. And they, who write for opinions they are sincerely persuaded of, and believe to be true, think they may so far allow themselves to indulge their laudable affection to truth, as to permit their esteem of it to give it the best colours, and set it off with the best expressions and dress they can, thereby to gain it the easiest entrance into the minds of their readers, and fix it deepest there.

One of those being the state of mind we may justly suppose most writers to be in, it is fit their readers, who apply to them for instruction, should not lay by

that caution which becomes a sincere pursuit of truth, and should make them always watchful against whatever might conceal or misrepresent it. If they have not the skill of representing to themselves the author's sense by pure ideas separated from sounds, and thereby divested of the false lights and deceitful ornaments of speech; this yet they should do; they should keep the precise question steadily in their minds, carry it along with them through the whole discourse, and suffer not the least alteration in the terms, either by addition, subtraction, or substituting any other. This every one can do who has a mind to it; and he that has not a mind to it, it is plain makes his understanding only the ware-house of other mens lumber; I mean false and unconcluding reasoning, rather than a repository of truth for his own use, which will prove substantial, and stand him in stead, when he has occasion for it. And whether such an one deals fairly by his own mind, and conducts his own understanding right, I leave to his own understanding to judge.

§ 42. *Fundamental Verities.*

THE mind of man being very narrow, and so slow in making acquaintance with things, and taking in new truths, that no one man is capable, in a much longer life than ours, to know all truths: it becomes our prudence, in our search after knowledge, to employ our thoughts about fundamental and material questions, carefully avoiding those that are trifling, and not suffering ourselves to be diverted from our main even purpose, by those that are merely incidental. How much of many young mens time is thrown away in purely logical inquiries, I need not mention. This is no better than if a man, who was to be a painter, should spend all his time in examining the threads of the several cloths he is to paint upon, and counting the hairs of each pencil and brush he intends to use in the laying on of his colours. Nay, it is much worse than for a young painter to spend his apprenticeship in such useless niceties; for he, at the end of all his pains to no purpose, finds that it is not painting, nor

any help to it, and so is really to no purpose: Whereas men designed for scholars have often their heads so filled and warmed with disputes on logical questions, that they take those airy useless notions for real and substantial knowledge, and think their understandings so well furnished with science, that they need not look any farther into the nature of things, or descend to the mechanical drudgery of experiment and inquiry. This is so obvious a mismanagement of the understanding, and that in the professed way to knowledge, that it could not be passed by: to which might be joined abundance of questions, and the way of handling them in the schools. What faults in particular of this kind, every man is, or may be guilty of, would be infinite to enumerate; it suffices to have shown, that superficial and slight discoveries and observations that contain nothing of moment in themselves, nor serve as clues to lead us into farther knowledge, should not be thought worth our searching after.

There are fundamental truths that lie at the bottom, the basis upon which a great many others rest, and in which they have their consistency. These are teeming truths, rich in store, with which they furnish the mind, and like the lights of heaven, are not only beautiful and entertaining in themselves, but give light and evidence to other things, that without them could not be seen or known. Such is that admirable discovery of Mr. Newton, that all bodies gravitate to one another, which may be counted as the basis of natural philosophy; which of what use it is to the understanding of the great frame of our solar system, he has to the astonishment of the learned world shown, and how much farther it would guide us in other things, if rightly pursued, is not yet known. Our Saviour's great rule, that *we should love our neighbour as ourselves*, is such a fundamental truth for the regulating human society, that, I think, by that alone, one might without difficulty determine all the cases and doubts, in social morality. These, and such as

these are the truths we should endeavour to find out, and store our minds with. Which leads me to another thing in the conduct of the understanding that is no less necessary, *viz.*

§ 43. *Bottoming.*

To accustom ourselves in any question proposed, to examine and find out upon what it bottoms. Most of the difficulties that come in our way, when well considered and traced, lead us to some proposition, which known to be true clears the doubt, and gives an easy solution of the question, whilst topical and superficial arguments, of which there is store to be found on both sides, filling the head with variety of thoughts, and the mouth with copious discourse, serve only to amuse the understanding, and entertain company without coming to the bottom of the question, the only place of rest and stability for an inquisitive mind, whose tendency is only to truth and knowledge.

For example, if it be demanded, whether the Grand Signior can lawfully take what he will from any of his people? This question cannot be resolved without coming to a certainty, whether all men are naturally equal; for upon that it turns, and that truth well settled in the understanding, and carried in the mind through the various debates concerning the various rights of men in society, will go a great way in putting an end to them, and showing on which side the truth is.

§ 44. *Transferring of Thoughts.*

THERE is scarce any thing more for the improvement of knowledge, for the ease of life, and the dispatch of business, than for a man to be able to dispose of his own thoughts; and there is scarce any thing harder in the whole conduct of the understanding than to get a full mastery over it. The mind, in a waking man, has always some object that it applies itself to; which, when we are lazy or unconcerned, we can easily change, and at pleasure transfer our thoughts to another, and from thence to a third, which has no relation to either of the former. Hence men forwardly

conclude, and frequently say, nothing is so free as thought, and it were well it were so; but the contrary will be found true in several instances; and there are many cases wherein there is nothing more resty and ungovernable than our thoughts: they will not be directed what objects to pursue, nor be taken off from those they have once fixed on, but run away with a man in pursuit of those ideas they have in view, let him do what he can.

I will not here mention again what I have above taken notice of, how hard it is to get the mind, narrowed by a custom of thirty or forty years standing to a scanty collection of obvious and common ideas, to enlarge itself to a more copious stock, and grow into an acquaintance with those that would afford more abundant matter of useful contemplation; it is not of this I am here speaking. The inconveniency I would here represent and find a remedy for, is the difficulty there is sometimes to transfer our minds from one subject to another, in cases where the ideas are equally familiar to us.

Matters that are recommended to our thoughts by any of our passions, take possession of our minds with a kind of authority, and will not be kept out or dislodged, but as if the passion that rules, were, for the time, the sheriff of the place, and came with all the *posse*, the understanding is seized and taken with the object it introduces, as if it had a legal right to be alone considered there. There is scarce any body, I think, of so calm a temper who hath not sometime found this tyranny on his understanding, and suffered under the inconvenience of it. Who is there almost, whose mind, at some time or other, love or anger, fear or grief has not so fastened to some clog, that it could not turn itself to any other object? I call it a clog, for it hangs upon the mind so as to hinder its vigour and activity in the pursuit of other contemplations, and advances itself little or not at all in the knowledge of the thing which it so closely hugs and constantly pores on. Men thus possessed, are sometimes as if they

were so in the worst sense, and lay under the power of an enchantment. They see not what passes before their eyes; hear not the audible discourse of the company; and when by any strong application to them they are roused a little, they are like men brought to themselves from some remote region; whereas, in truth they come no farther than their secret cabinet within, where they have been wholly taken up with the puppet, which is for that time appointed for their entertainment. The shame that such dumps cause to well-bred people, when it carries them away from the company, where they should bear a part in the conversation, is a sufficient argument, that it is a fault in the conduct of our understanding, not to have that power over it as to make use of it to those purposes, and on those occasions wherein we have need of its assistance. The mind should be always free and ready to turn itself to the variety of objects that occur, and allow them as much consideration as shall for that time be thought fit. To be engrossed so by one object, as not to be prevailed on to leave it for another that we judge fitter for our contemplation, is to make it of no use to us. Did this state of mind remain always so, every one would, without scruple, give it the name of perfect madness; and whilst it does last, at whatever intervals it returns, such a rotation of thoughts about the same object no more carries us forwards towards the attainment of knowledge, than getting upon a mill-horse whilst he jogs on in his circular track would carry a man a journey.

I grant something must be allowed to legitimate passions, and to natural inclinations. Every man, besides occasional affections, has beloved studies, and those the mind will more closely stick to; but yet it is best that it should be always at liberty, and under the free disposal of the man, to act how, and upon what he directs. This we should endeavour to obtain, unless we would be content with such a flaw in our understandings, that sometimes we should be as it were without it; for it is very little better than so in

cases where we cannot make use of it to those purposes we would, and which stand in present need of it.

But before fit remedies can be thought on for this disease, we must know the several causes of it, and thereby regulate the cure, if we will hope to labour with success.

One we have already instanced in, whereof all men that reflect have so general a knowledge, and so often an experience in themselves, that nobody doubts of it. A prevailing passion so pins down our thoughts to the object and concern of it, that a man passionately in love cannot bring himself to think of his ordinary affairs, or a kind mother drooping under the loss of a child, is not able to bear a part as she was wont in the discourse of the company or conversation of her friends.

But though passion be the most obvious and general, yet it is not the only cause that binds up the understanding, and confines it for the time to one object, from which it will not be taken off.

Besides this, we may often find that the understanding, when it has a while employed itself upon a subject which either chance, or some slight accident offered to it, without the interest or recommendation of any passion, works itself into a warmth, and by degrees gets into a career, wherein, like a bowl down a hill, it increases its motion by going, and will not be stopped or diverted; though, when the heat is over, it sees all this earnest application was about a trifle not worth a thought, and all the pains employed about it, lost labour.

There is a third sort, if I mistake not, yet lower than this; it is a sort of childishness, if I may so say, of the understanding, wherein, during the fit, it plays with, and dandles some insignificant puppet to no end, nor with any design at all, and yet cannot easily be got off from it. Thus some trivial sentence, or a scrap of poetry will sometimes get into mens heads, and make such a chiming there, that there is no stilling of it; no peace to be obtained, nor attention to

any thing else, but this impertinent guest will take up the mind and possess the thoughts, in spite of all endeavours to get rid of it. Whether every one hath experimented in themselves this troublesome intrusion of some frisking ideas which thus importune the understanding, and hinder it from being better employed, I know not: but persons of very good parts, and those more than one, I have heard speak and complain of it themselves. The reason I have to make this doubt, is from what I have known of a case something of kin to this, though much odder, and that is of a sort of visions that some people have lying quiet, but perfectly awake, in the dark, or with their eyes shut. It is a great variety of faces, most commonly very odd ones, that appear to them in train one after another; so that having had just the sight of one, it immediately passes away to give place to another, that the same instant succeeds, and has as quick an exit as its leader, and so they march on in a constant succession; nor can any one of them by any endeavour be stopped or retained beyond the instant of its appearance, but is thrust out by its followers, which will have its turn. Concerning this fantastical phenomenon, I have talked with several people, whereof some have been perfectly acquainted with it, and others have been so wholly strangers to it, that they could hardly be brought to conceive or believe it. I knew a lady of excellent parts who had got past thirty, without having ever had the least notice of any such thing; she was so great a stranger to it, that when she heard me and another talking of it, could scarce forbear thinking we bantered her; but sometime after drinking a large dose of dilute tea (as she was ordered by a physician) going to bed, she told us at next meeting, that she had now experimented what our discourse had much ado to persuade her of. She had seen a great variety of faces in a long train, succeeding one another, as we had described; they were all strangers and intruders, such as she had no acquaintance with before, nor sought after then, and as

they came of themselves they went too ; none of them stayed a moment, nor could be detained by all the endeavours she could use, but went on in their solemn procession, just appeared and then vanished. This odd phenomenon seems to have a mechanical cause, and to depend upon the matter and motion of the blood or animal spirits.

When the fancy is bound by passion, I know no way to set the mind free, and at liberty to prosecute what thoughts the man would make choice of, but to allay the present passion, or counter-balance it with another, which is an art to be got by study, and acquaintance with the passions.

Those, who find themselves apt to be carried away with the spontaneous current of their own thoughts, not excited by any passion or interest, must be very wary and careful in all the instances of it to stop it, and never humour their minds in being thus triflingly busy. Men know the value of their corporal liberty, and therefore suffer not willingly fetters and chains to be put upon them. To have the mind captivated, is, for the time, certainly the greater evil of the two, and deserves our utmost care and endeavours to preserve the freedom of our better part. And in this case our pains will not be lost ; striving and struggling will prevail, if we constantly, in all such occasion, make use of it. We must never indulge these trivial attentions of thought ; as soon as we find the mind makes itself a business of nothing, we should immediately disturb and check it, introduce new and more serious considerations, and not leave till we have beaten it off from the pursuit it was upon. This, at first, if we have let the contrary practice grow to an habit, will perhaps be difficult ; but constant endeavours will by degrees prevail, and at last make it easy. And when a man is pretty well advanced, and can command his mind off at pleasure from incidental and undesigned pursuits, it may not be amiss for him to go on farther, and make attempts upon meditations of greater moment, that at last he may have a full

power over his own mind, and be so fully master of his own thoughts, as to be able to transfer them from one subject to another, with the same ease that he can lay by any thing he has in his hand, and take something else that he has a mind to in the room of it. This liberty of mind is of great use both in business and study, and he that has got it will have no small advantage of ease and dispatch in all that is the chosen and useful employment of his understanding.

The third and last way which I mentioned the mind to be sometimes taken up with, I mean the chiming of some particular words or sentence in the memory, and, as it were, making a noise in the head, and the like, seldom happens, but when the mind is lazy or very loosely and negligently employed. It were better indeed be without such impertinent and useless repetitions. Any obvious idea, when it is roving causelessly at a venture, being of more use, and apter to suggest something worth consideration, than the insignificant buz of purely empty sounds. But since the rousing of the mind, and setting the understanding on work with some degrees of vigour, does for the most part presently set it free from these idle companions; it may not be amiss whenever we find ourselves troubled with them, to make use of so profitable a remedy that is always at hand.

END OF VOLUME THIRD.

f
n
-
.s
l
n

H
g,
e
r
s
t
-
e
c
.
.

.

.

.